

Slavery - 1/2 - 1/2 - 1/2
THE

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

(AMERICAN AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,)

PRESENTED AT NEW-YORK, MAY 6, 1851 ;

WITH

THE ADDRESSES AND RESOLUTIONS.

New-York :

PUBLISHED BY THE AM. & FOR. ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

WILLIAM HARNED, OFFICE AGENT, 48 BEEKMAN STREET.

1851. .

Gift of
Rev. S. McKeen

12160

Annual Meeting.

THE Eleventh Annual Meeting of the AMERICAN AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY was held in the Broadway Tabernacle, on Tuesday, May 6th, 1851, at 3 o'clock P. M. The chair was occupied by ARTHUR TAPPAN, President of the Society.

The 94th Psalm was read in a very impressive manner by Rev. Dr. Lansing.

A fervent prayer was then offered by Rev. CHARLES W. GARDINER.

An abstract of the Annual Report was read by LEWIS TAPPAN, Corresponding Secretary. After which Rev. S. E. CORNISH offered the following Resolution, which was adopted :

Resolved, That the Annual Report, of which an abstract has been read, be accepted, and that the same be referred to the Executive Committee for publication.

The Corresponding Secretary then presented, in behalf of the Executive Committee, a set of RESOLUTIONS, which were adopted by the Meeting, as follows :

Resolved, That American Slavery is the most sinful, cruel and merciless system that has prevailed in any civilized country, inasmuch as, under the light of the gospel, it deprives men, not only guiltless, but unaccused of crime, of every civil and religious right ; denies them legal compensation for any wrong, however grievous ; annihilates in regard to them the conjugal and parental relations ; consigns them at pleasure to heathenism ; withholds from them the Bible ; and reduces them to the condition of brutes.

Resolved, That it is our right to condemn, and by lawful means to abolish sinful institutions, wherever existing ; that it is the peculiar right of American citizens to express, orally or through the press, their opinions of the conduct of their representatives, and of the laws passed by them ; and that every attempt to prevent or control the free expression of opinion is an outrage upon the constitutional rights of the citizen, and a dangerous assault upon the liberties of the country.

Resolved, That we have never proposed to abolish slavery by any unconstitutional act, nor to infringe upon the rights of the States : our Doctrine being Universal Emancipation without compensation, and our Measures, under God, Moral Suasion and the Ballot Box.

Resolved, That we deem the Fugitive Slave Bill unconstitutional and inhuman, a disgrace to the country, an outrage upon civil liberty, deserving the reprobation of every friend of God and man ; and that it should be disobeyed by every person who is not willing, and does not deserve, to wear the chain and submit to the lash of Southern despots.

Resolved, That every man who has taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and who believes the Fugitive Slave Bill unconstitutional, is solemnly bound to oppose this enactment ; and that, in the language of Mr. Justice

McLean, "An unconstitutional act of Congress imposes no obligation on a State, or the people of a State, and may be resisted by an individual or community."

Resolved, That we believe that the late act of Congress for the recovery of fugitive slaves makes demands upon individuals to which they cannot yield obedience without a direct violation of the principles of love, mercy, and justice, given by the Saviour to his disciples; and that those professed ministers of the Redeemer who teach obedience to this law are false teachers, and unfaithful to the high and holy profession they have assumed.

Resolved, That the attempt of the Slave Power to enforce an alleged constitutional provision with regard to fugitive slaves, while it sets at naught an undisputed constitutional provision with reference to colored seamen, is an apt illustration of the mode in which the South understands and fulfils the "compromises" of the Constitution, and the manner in which, aided and abetted by Northern allies, it has governed the country for the last half century.

Resolved, That the audacious attempt made to convert the free States into a great hunting-ground for fugitive slaves, has inspired an unutterable disgust toward the accursed system of which it is an off-shoot, and awakened a deep sympathy for the bondman that will, we believe, insure a repeal of the Bill, the political death of its framers and abettors, and a vast increase of the anti slavery sentiment of the nation.

Resolved, That notwithstanding the temporary triumph of the Slave Power, in consequence of the treachery or apostasy of Northern politicians, merchants who sell their principles *with* their goods, and pro-slavery preachers, the people of the free States have, it is hoped, ceased to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to the oligarchy of the South, or their allies the dough-faces of the North.

Resolved, That we exult in the election of the Hon. Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, to the office of United States Senator, as the triumph of a glorious cause, achieved in the person of one who will not, it is believed, barter his fair fame for gold or office, or ever prove treacherous to the principles of liberty, the cause of the slave, or the true interests of the country.

Resolved, That we are the friends of the Union and the Constitution, and will labor to have them sustained according to the well-known intentions of the patriots of the Revolution, but that we do not desire their continuance, if perverted to the destruction of Freedom and Religion.

Resolved, That we are the friends of a true Republican Government, of a Free Christianity, and of the Equal Rights of men, in opposition to Cotton Whiggery, Cotton Democracy, and Cotton Theology, and that we welcome to our ranks men of every sect and party who are in favor of a righteous Civil Government, the abolition of Caste, the downfall of Oppression, and the supremacy of the Divine Law.

Resolved, That we will not bestow our suffrages on any candidate for office who we have reason to believe would, if elected, exert his influence to maintain and enforce the Fugitive Slave Bill, oppress the People of Color, or refuse, at any time, to cast his vote *for* Freedom and *against* Slavery.

Resolved, That the thanks of the community are due to the liberty-loving members of Congress and State Legislatures, ministers of the gospel, and conductors of the press, who have advocated the cause of human rights, proclaimed the law of the living God, and been true to the instincts of Humanity, in despite of the combined influence of Wealth and Power, and the opposition of pro-slavery men in Church and State.

Resolved, That we sympathize with the oppressed of every clime, and especially with those of our own country, and promise them our succor in all times of their distress, according to the Golden Rule.

Resolved, That the agitation of the Slavery question has not ceased, nor will it in our opinion cease, until the great stain upon the national escutcheon is removed, and the Higher Law gains ascendancy in the councils of the nation.

Resolved, That we rejoice in the formation of Anti-Slavery Societies of similar principles, and wish Godspeed to every effort to diffuse information, succor the distressed, bring about the emancipation of the enslaved, and the removal of prejudice against the free people of color, in a way consonant with Truth, Justice, and Christianity.

Resolved, That we tender our thanks to the free and hospitable inhabitants of Canada for the succor and relief they have so generously bestowed upon our countrymen who have fled from oppression, sought an asylum among them, and placed themselves under the protection of British law and philanthropy.

Resolved, That we renewedly and fervently commend the great cause of Human Freedom to the care and protection of Almighty God, beseeching Him to inspire all who labor for emancipation with wisdom from on high, to grant them a spirit of prayer, an exhibition of meekness, fidelity, perseverance, and confidence in His promise that the rod of the oppressor shall be broken and the oppressed go free.

The meeting was then addressed by the Rev. HENRY WARD BEECHER, substantially as follows:

Mr. President and Fellow-Citizens:—I do not forget in appearing before you the profession to which I belong, nor do I misapprehend, I think, the complexion of this audience, when I suppose by far the greater number of them are religious persons; and to me as a minister of the gospel, and to you I presume as Christians or Christianly educated, the moral aspects of the question of slavery will be the most important and the most interesting. I shall not speak on this subject from the stand-point of the politician, nor shall I regard it, weighty as are the considerations, from the stand-point of the commercialist, nor even the philanthropist as such; but as a man that believes in God, in the immortality of the soul, in the rational and accountable nature of every man that lives, an accountability enhanced immensely by the gospel; as a minister of the gospel preaching to accountable beings such an immortality in behalf of God manifested in the flesh; as such a one I think upon the subject of slavery, I ponder its evils and its tendencies, and as such a one I feel deeply interested to speak to you concerning this gigantic, this massive evil. I apprehend, fellow-citizens, that if it were put to vote in this great audience—I had almost said in this great metropolis—there scarcely would be one dissenting voice that slavery, looked at through and through, up and down, from core to skin and from skin back again to core, that slavery is an evil. I believe no man in his senses would pronounce it not to be an evil. I believe that every man would agree that it is an evil contrary to the spirit of religion, and no man would admit that it was not contrary to the spirit of democratic institutions. I believe that every man would say that it is an evil which stands up in this nation solitary, gaunt, hideous, finding no sympathy in our laws and institutions as republicans, no sympathy in our religion as Christians, and no sympathy in our citizens as philanthropists. It is therefore a matter worthy of preliminary consideration how such an evil should have gained root-room, and have gained such extension, that it has already become a matter of fear lest it should eat out the precious liberties bequeathed to us by our forefathers. Look at it in that point of view. The world never saw such a wonder as American slavery existing against custom, against public sentiment, against religious institutions, against our Constitution which was founded for the promotion of liberty, against the spirit of our history, against the strife of our forefathers, against the breath of religion, and against the providence of God. How could such an evil have so advanced upon us, as to make inroads upon the shore, beating down dikes, and more and more sweeping its waves onward and overwhelming every thing in its destructive course? How could it have been? Why, it may be said, though this is an imperfect explanation, that there is in every man an essential love of irresponsible power. I take it that monarchical governments do not make kings; I take it that in civil affairs every man has an old king's heart under his ribs; and in ecclesiastical affairs it is the lot of poor human nature for every man to have a pope's heart under his ribs. If we could have our own way we should exclaim, I am master and you are my slave. This spirit is not the result of the political institutions; it precedes and forms them. Power is sweet, and once obtained, the hand almost irresistibly holds on to it. It would be enough to say in respect to our land that slavery, being forced upon us as it was in our youthful days, after we had become the possessors of slaves, was fastened upon us by the love of power, and we refused to give it up.

But there came up other causes than these; for such was the strife and influence of religion against slavery in its early days that it began to relax its hold, and the prospect, at the adoption of the Constitution and confederation of our States, was that slavery would be like late snows in April, soon melted away. In the North, it soon disappeared, and the universal expectation was that it would soon go in the South, otherwise there never could have been what are termed the "compromises of the Constitution." Yet there came a turn of affairs in which there came to be commercial profits connected; with slavery there came to be the cultivation of rice, cotton and sugar; and the value of slaves rose in the market on account of the rise in value of these products; and thus, when slavery was on the very eve of being

abolished in our land, it was again rejuvenated and strengthened, because it became commercially profitable to strengthen it; and although commerce is acknowledging the influence and power of Christianity, it is feared, so weak is human nature, that where there is a prospect of large gains nothing can restrain the aggressions of commerce. It is yet true as it once was that the love of money is the root of all evil. I do not mean that money is an evil, if regarded only as a medium to carry out necessary and beneficial purposes; for in this there is no real love, no idolizing it. Men should use money as a lever; and who loves his crowbar because he has used it for rolling stones? But suppose one should set up a crowbar and bow down to it; and should say his prayers to his lever! So money used as an instrument is good, and may God bless the use of it. But when men enjoy money in such a way as that the affections given for wife and child, and friend and country, and God, are absorbed in the love of money, then it is that it becomes an evil; and there are now men thin and wrinkled walking in your streets whose hearts seem ploughed all over with avarice, and dried up to every other affection than that of increased wealth and an intense love of gain. Such men there are in every community; and although religion makes good battle against it, yet thus far Christianity has not succeeded in removing this growing spirit from the commercial circles of the globe. Lord Brougham said, "When the profits of the slave-trade exceed two or three hundred per cent., all the navies of the globe could not stop the trade on the coast of Africa." So when profits rise one or two hundred per cent., all the power of religion cannot stop men from doing wrong, and it cannot kill slavery, especially when we have a few clergymen to step in, in good time, to baptize the wrong and call it Christianity. (Laughter.)

But there were developed, over and above the considerations I have dwelt upon, other reasons why this gigantic evil was fastened upon us, so adverse in every respect to the spirit of our institutions, and that is the element of political power which was given to the slave interest. Its full power and bearing I suppose was not understood at the time of the adoption of our Constitution; for we should remember that we built our Constitution somewhat as we build steamboats. The naval architect has his own idea of what will displace the least amount of water and give the greatest force to the wheel, and he builds the boat to realize his idea; but you cannot tell when a ship is on the stocks what she will do, or whether she will perform as you designed. You must launch her, get up her steam; and then it sometimes happens that the ship that was expected to beat the world turns out to be an inferior affair, and on the other hand the ship that was not much thought of on the stocks proves to be a superior vessel, and excels all competitors. So the wisest heads, judging of the ship of State during her construction, could not tell exactly what she was going to be; some things in our Constitution acted a great deal better than its framers thought, and some things turned out worse, it is to be hoped, than was expected. At the time of its adoption there was one hearty desire, North and South, that the Constitution of these United States should be a *bona fide* instrument of liberty. It was never in contemplation by Northern or Southern delegates to make the Constitution sanction slavery.

But there is another matter to which I must advert. It is to be remembered that all the causes I have mentioned could not have fastened upon us the evils of slavery in such variety, in such intensity, if there had been exerted upon it the influences of Christianity; and therefore, I say, that one of the reasons why slavery has made such headway is, that the forces of Christianity have never been fully arrayed against it, and at this day are not arrayed against it; and this is the thought I wish now to elaborate. Must I say then that the Church is corrupt? No; I say no such thing. I admit that it is not perfect. It has its evils; but I honor its institutions. I love the Church; with all her faults I love her. No greater evil could betide the world, and none is more to be dreaded, than that evil which should sweep the Church from its foundations; for she is the mother of the world's mercies. Do I say then, when I declare that Christianity has not done its work, that the body of ministers is a body of time-serving and corrupt men? God is my judge, if I do not believe that the ministers of the various denominations of these United States represent as faithful and as true-minded a body of men as any other equal number of men on the face of the globe. They, perhaps, are sometimes warped in their opinions, and sometimes prejudiced. Some go to ultraisms on this tack, and some by conservatism go to ultraism in that direction; but with all their faults and shortcomings, I could give them, not only my confidence, but my heart and hand, and say to them, God bless you, as God through you is blessing his poor sin-lost world. What then, am I any the less true when I say that though I honor and praise the Church, and love the ministry of the Church, of all denominations, yet neither the ministry nor the Church has borne that testi-

mony, nor exerted that influence upon the subject of slavery that it ought to have done? It has not yet preached the truths of the gospel in such variety and power, it has not arrayed its truths in such a way, as that it should be abated.

Fellow-citizens, the gospel finds its way in this world as does the water on the mountains. It goes creeping down, hunting for channels here and there, and working its sinuous way in every direction. At last, when a level is found, a current is established, and the water has free course to run. The spirit of Christianity is like the rays of the morning sun, that begin on the mountain top, and creep down into the valley, and up the smaller hills and down their farther sides; and so it works its way latitude by latitude, and parallel by parallel, till it shines round the globe. So the spirit of religion begins. It takes men and cultivates them, and a generation of men, and a world, little by little, until gradually they approach the full stature of the perfect man.

Now what I say is this, that the spirit of Christianity has never yet come up to the subject of slavery, and dealt with it as it has a right to deal with it, and as I believe ere long it will deal with this subject.

Let me now inquire, what is the attitude of Christianity towards the slaves of this country? You and I shall perfectly agree, that, if there be one thing characteristic of the gospel of Christ, it was that it did not regard ranks and degrees; and in this it was a paradox, for it regarded nothing so much. I will explain. It was nothing to Christ that men were rich or poor, high or low, Jew or Gentile, bond or free. There was one level, they were all alike to Christ; and yet there was another respect in which Christ did regard the ranks and gradations of society. There was one class very much enlightened, another still less enlightened, and another still less. Christ began at the bottom where men were the poorest, the weakest, the most ignorant, and the most helpless; or, as Christ himself said, in that beautiful similitude drawn from the shepherd's life, "I came to seek and to save the lost,"—those who had strayed from the fold and were surrounded with dangers. They first that were the lowest Christ took, and then moved upwards in the scale. And that is the spirit of Christianity, to pay its first regards to the poor; and therefore, when John sent to Christ to ask for the evidences of his Messiahship, He said to the messenger, "Go and tell John, the dead are raised, the blind receive their sight, the lepers are healed;" and then, as a climax that could not be resisted, "the poor have the gospel preached to them." [That was the reply that was made; and I say it is the duty of ministers of the gospel, and the duty of the Church, to regard those that are ignorant, those that are low, those that are poor, those that are weak, those that are despised. The spirit of Christianity is to go down to them first, and take care of them, defend them, educate them, love them, and save them. This is Christianity; and I hope there is no man on this broad continent who is not glad that this is Christianity, and that there is hope for the laborer, hope for the slave, and hope for the oppressed. For if it were not for this divine and benignant spirit of Christianity, if it were the rich, the high-favored only, that Christianity cared for, if God should go upon their side, against the poor and the weak, they would be as the dust of the summer threshing-floor, and fly away, and none could save them. Now I ask, is this the spirit of Christianity? Has it been exerted in behalf of the African race? Have we treated them as the spirit of Christianity teaches us that we should treat them? Well, let us look at the South and see. The rights of three millions of men in the South are absolutely taken away from them. A system prevails there—in a land of churches too—which destroys the manhood of three millions of men. I shall have occasion to reiterate this idea, and I wish to burn it into your understandings, that the evil of slavery does not lie in the fact that one man or twenty men are obliged to eat coarse corn bread and no meat, wear linsey-woolsey, and live in shanties. It is, that American slavery begins with this fundamental canon, that the *slave is not a man*. It is written in the slave laws that a slave is a chattel, that is to say, an animal, or a piece of furniture; and thus it denies to three millions of men the rights of manhood. It leaves the mind therefore a blank. It leaves religion and the religious education of the slave to mere chance. It is a system which renders chastity in either sex almost an impossibility; a system which breaks up the family, and brings father, mother, brother, and sister to the block to be sold with mules, horses, oxen, and hogs, and dispersed hither and thither as the buyer may deem proper. This is the *system*, not the abuse.

Fellow-citizens, about four thousand years ago there was another system of slavery. It is well known as Hebrew slavery; and I have so often heard the subject of slavery justified as a Bible system, justified by Hebrew slavery, that I wish to call your attention to this subject. And I will now make a fair challenge to the gentlemen from the South, and especially to the clergymen of the South—and if I could stand in

Georgia, I both would speak as I do about slavery, and what is more, they would treat me fully as respectfully as I am treated here, and better, I think—if you will agree to put American slavery on the ground where the Bible puts it, I will give it up, and I will say that the Bible does allow slavery, and did make laws, and did legislate for slaves. We will make a compromise—for this is a day of compromises, though they are not always fair compromises. I will give up the argument that the Bible is against slavery, if you will agree to put your slavery on the platform of Bible slavery. There were three kinds of servitude practised in those days. The first was Hebrew slavery, a slavery in which the Hebrews were sold for a short period. It was a kind of apprenticeship, scarcely more rigorous than our modern system of apprenticeship. No Hebrew could be sold for a longer period than seven years. The sabbatical year set him free. This slavery was full of all manner of ameliorations, and not hard to be borne.

There was also a system of slavery which might be called public slavery—that of the Gibeonites conquered in war. They lived among themselves, and took care of themselves. They worked, as our penitentiary convicts work, for the commonwealth. There was a third kind of slavery which might be called the Hebrew bond service. This was the real slavery practised by the Hebrews. Now I find it a great deal cheaper to admit the existence of this slavery, and that it was a grievous slavery, than to dispute it for fear the Bible should seem to be on the side of oppression. Moses did not introduce nor enact slavery. He regulated it; and first, what was the regulation? He forbade the Hebrews buying any one but a heathen for a slave, and forbade them buying even a heathen, except on this condition, that he would receive circumcision and become a Jew. Therefore, the first introduction of a man into bond service was the *recognition of him as a moral and accountable being*, and he was brought at once under the religious institutions and instructions of the Jewish people. It was made obligatory on every Hebrew who owned a slave, to see that he was religiously educated.

But pause one moment to see how much was meant by *religious* education in that day. We have the family government, which is the most blessed of all governments. The child next goes to the common school, then to the academy, then to the college, and finally out into the community, and becomes a member of various associations and societies. There he has the intercourse of scientific men; he has his magazines, his newspapers, and his libraries. Our learning is augmented a thousand fold, our education is distributed into a thousand cells. But the time once was, when it was compressed into five little books. The Jews had no newspaper, and no institution of an educational kind; and when you had educated a man in the Pentateuch, the laws of Moses, you had given him the sum of all the human knowledge of that day. You had, as it were, put him through college and graduated him. When a Hebrew slave, therefore, was educated in the knowledge of the Mosaic books, that man was dealt with as if a Southern man should take a slave and send him North, as he would his own son, and put him through college, and then bring him back and put him to the plough and the hoe. (Cheers.) That is the way the Hebrews educated their slaves; and not only so, reckoning the Sabbath days and holidays, the seventh years, and the fiftieth year, a calculation would show that all their slaves had at least one half their time, in which no work was required of them, for leisure; and moreover, the Hebrew bond slave, although he was a bond slave for life, had applied to him all those motives under which men are developed. Under certain circumstances he could acquire property, and rise to honor, and be just as good, and stand just as high, and become well nigh as independent, as any other citizen; and therefore he had the stimulant of ambition, of hope, of character. This was the Jewish system of bond slavery. It began by recognizing every man as a moral and accountable being. It proceeded consequently to legislate for his religious instruction, and all the legislation of Moses was in favor of the slave and not in favor of the master. If injustice was done him, the slave could go into the courts and be heard in his own cause. If the master was so vile as to abuse and beat him, the wound itself set him free; and lastly, if the slave being so abused should run away, there was a standing enactment that no man should return the fugitive to his master. It was understood that under the regulations of Moses, the system of slavery would be so easy and pleasant to him that he would not wish to run away from his master; but if he did, it was *prima facie* evidence that he ought to run away; and it is so all the world over.

Four thousand years have passed. Here was a hardy nation who had scarcely shaken the sand out of their shoes, who had but just dried their garments—no, I forgot! they crossed on dry land—they scarcely had found their place in their promised land, while their shoulders were yet sore with the burdens they had borne; these

men became themselves masters in their turn; and this is the system they instituted four thousand years ago; and this too without any Bible revealed to them; for they had only a part of it—the Pentateuch. The whole of the Prophets, and the Psalms, and the New Testament were not yet theirs. Here was their system of oppression, if you are pleased so to call it. We have had since that day—oh, how much! We have the appearance of Christ himself, the recorded gospel, and Christian institutions. How has the world grown in the knowledge of human relations and human rights! Since the days of Christ, we have had revolutions, and contentions, and battles; and liberty of conscience and civil liberty have been hewn out of the rocky state of despotism. What expansion also in learning, what attainments in science, and what knowledge of legislation and civil government! And now, we too have tried our hand at a system of slavery. The Hebrew slavery began with the recognition that man was a moral and accountable agent; four thousand years have passed away, and we began our system of slavery by declaring that a slave is a brute, a chattel, and not a man! The Hebrew law maintained that when a man became a slave, he should be circumcised and come under Jewish instruction; four thousand years have gone, and American slavery takes no care of the slave as a religious being, the law makes no provision for his moral training. In that remote age, among that rude people, the laws rigidly guarded the chastity of woman, and if her master violated her honor, she became his wife; but four thousand years have passed, and an institution of slavery has been set afoot in America, and in this Christian land, among Christian churches, under the full blaze and power of the gospel in its summer heat, the chastity of men and women is utterly neglected—as much so as that of the horse, the dog, or the hog; and this is the advance we have made in this Christian land of America! Then there were laws for the slave; now the laws are for the master. Four thousand years ago, courts were established where the slave could go and tell his story; now there is not a court from Mason and Dixon's line to Texas, that will allow a black man, whether bond or free, to open his lips. This is the American system of servitude. That was the Hebrew! Are they alike? Do the outrages of American slavery find any countenance in the humanity and leniency of its oft alleged prototype?

Now, fellow-citizens, I ask you, would it not be a great gain if we could bring the South to a compromise, if we could bring African slavery on to the platform of Hebrew slavery? If you would bring about this compromise, you must recognize the slave to be a man, and not a chattel. You must give him books, let him read the Bible, open churches for him, erect courts for him or open to him those now existing, pass laws to protect him. The moment you are obliged to treat slaves as men, the trouble, the labor, the time, the responsibility are such that no man will hold slaves. It is hard enough for me, with a family of three small children, to educate and take care of them; but suppose I had five hundred children, what should I do? Suppose you enact the law of the Hebrews—the Lord have mercy on some of our Southern planters, who would have to take care of and instruct all their vast number of slaves, and be responsible for their religious education! It could not be done, and slavery would come to an end.

This is the system of Christian slavery at the South—in brief. I have but just touched it. As the artist takes his chalk and draws out a sketch of his design, so I have but chalked the outlines of the real system of slavery.

What then has Christianity in America done in behalf of the African as a slave? Has there been any pulpit or Christian church in the South, where Christianity has stood up and rebuked this infamous, God-defying doctrine, that a slave is a chattel? When, where? Never, nowhere! Where has there been a Christian in the South, who has stood up and said to the community, You must give up your slaves or regard them as moral and accountable beings? In some few instances there has been a devotion to truth and duty in this matter which was well, and which I trust will be imitated; but take the South comprehensively, this has not been done. Where has there been any Southern Christian, who has rebuked the infamous prostitution of the sexes, that is as common in the South as the slaves themselves are?

Fellow-citizens, fornication and adultery at the South are no bar to church membership. (Hisses drowned by cheers.) I have talked a good while, and it is but fair now that you should talk! I go in for free discussion, as well as for free soil. I am glad there is an awakening conscience, and a sense of shame in this matter. Do you not know that a great many ministers in the South, when they celebrate the ceremony of marriage between slaves, leave out the injunction, "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder?" For they know that the man may be sold and sent one way and the woman the other. They may be members of the Baptist, Presbyterian or other Church, and when they go, their pastor gives them a letter that

certifies that they are in good and regular standing in the Church. Now, it is very plain that they cannot live together. He is received into the church and takes a wife, and although he has one already, yet his letter is clean. He is sold a second, a third, and a fourth time, and each time gets a wife; and if he is sold forty times he will have forty wives, and there is not one word said against it. His letter is good from church to church, and it is not considered inconsistent in the Christian character of a slave thus to violate the duty of chastity. Now these facts are notorious in the South, and are not only known but are not thought very much of. (A voice, "Nobody knows them but yourself") (Another voice, "There is a man in this city who has got twenty wives.") I am sorry for him. (Applause and laughter.)

And now I ask what has Christianity done for the African in the North? And on this point I cannot tarry. One thing is very plain if the truths I have stated are true; if the free African of the North is vicious, if he is ignorant, if he does not understand the ways of trade, the duty of the Church was to go down to him, and preach the gospel to him, to educate him and his children, to inspire him with a spirit of industry, and open the door to industrial occupations for him. That was the duty of Christianity. But what has the North done for the free African? Has it founded churches for him? They have built their own churches, with but very few exceptions; and it cannot be denied that Christianity has been signally deficient in preaching the gospel to the colored people of the North. Where are the schools that are open for them? Where are the motives to incite them to industrial occupations? There are none. The very doors of the shops in most of the trades are shut to the man of the sable skin; and he cannot be a clerk nor a journeyman, for our industrial classes feel that a man who has been a slave is not fit to work with a man who is a freeman. Thus has the odium extended northward. And what has Christianity done? Has it interposed, has it come in between them and the prejudices of this community, and undertaken to educate the public in regard to its duty? It has not done it. It has done worse than that. A few States give him the right of property and permit him to vote; but most of the legislation in the Northern and free States makes color a ground of disfranchisement. He cannot vote nor have property; he is put under bonds if he comes into some States, and every means is taken to eject him from the States. I know there is no man in his senses, that thinks of these things soberly, who will say it is not so. Is this the spirit of Christianity? Are our people acting Christian-like in this regard? Has the Church risen up and said, "By the power of Christ these men shall not be trampled in the dust; these men shall have the gospel preached to them, and shall be educated; these men shall have a chance given them to be respectable?" Oh! no; Christianity has pointed to the ship and said, "There is the ship, and there is Africa, and you had better go." That is the gospel that has been preached to them. "Emigrate, colonize." That is the gospel they have heard.

What is the danger that threatens the Church in America? Her danger is not from being extinguished by persecution. She is growing plethoric; she is waxing fat; she feels her spirit, and she kicks. Having so much riches, so much luxury, so much worldly prosperity, she is more like to die of obesity than of want. In the providence of God our whole western frontier is opened, in which the Church might work off, as it were, some of her fatness and superfluous flesh; and a despised and neglected multitude are in her midst to be educated and inspired to usefulness; but instead of that, she is trying to shirk her work, and give her children a free passage to Africa, thus getting rid of the work God has appointed her to do.

These remarks are not aimed at the Colonization Society, for I say most frankly and heartily, if any man really wishes to go to Africa, I am glad that there is a way, for Africa's sake and for his sake; and as far as that class of men are concerned, I believe in colonization for the sake of the continent, and no farther. When it is on the spur of necessity that they are colonized, and when there is such a prejudice at home that they cannot stay here, then I turn round and say, "The Lord rebuke thee, Satan." God has put a poor, despised, ignorant people among the Christians of this land, and said to them, "These are my people," and they rise and cast them into the sea. God will bring them to judgment for such things. First do your duty to them; educate them, and then with a better grace we may say to them, "Emigrate, colonize," and not till then.

I am very glad to say that, although this is a dark picture, it has been growing a little lighter within my remembrance. There has been generated within the past few years a higher tone of Christian feeling in respect to the free Africans of the North. The North has begun to be thoroughly aroused to the subject of slavery—aroused tempestuously, and not in the most prudent way I take it; but I will not

say a word against any who have endeavored to do well for liberty and humanity. Christian men have begun to study more thoroughly into the nature of the slave institution in the South and begun too with the Bible in their hand, determined to know what are the rules by which she is to judge of her duties. The result has been, that our churches have begun to pray and our ministers to preach more, and Northern men have been coming rapidly, for the last twenty years, into a more Christian state of feeling in respect to the African colored people of the North and the slaves of the South. The true way is to correct public sentiment at the North. Let it be sweetened and christianized by the gospel, and that will work quicker and go farther than it would to leave the North uncultivated and go and preach to the South. Here is the place; for where evils are to be reformed they must be attacked from without and not from within; and the curative process must begin in the North and not in the South; and this does not interfere with the fact that, after all, the Southerners must abolish their own slavery. The first effect of the increased fidelity of the North has been a fear that slavery must perish; and that gave rise to a desire to extend the slave territory; and, next, it gave rise to political agitations. It was seized hold of by politicians and incorporated into a national system of politics, and next it gave rise to that most execrable of all unbaptized monsters, the Fugitive Slave Law.

Fellow-citizens, there was a near prospect, it seems to me, five years ago, of a peaceable retrocession of slavery. There was an advance of moral public opinion, both in the North and in the South, which was most surprising. I do not believe one word of that doctrine that slavery became more firmly rooted in the South on account of agitation in the North. Why, you have got nothing but agitation to work with. Let me say to you that the day for despotic legislation and for brute force has passed away. IDEAS are kings now. Ideas are to legislate for the world; and the day has come when moral thoughts and moral principles are to be free as air. These have begun to travel in the South, and are still travelling. The plan which seemed opened before us was this, to drop all political and odious terms, to say to the slave interest, "Maintain your foothold as long as you please, but you cannot soil another foot of territory with slavery." There was nothing in the Constitution against that. Then, secondly, we would say, "You shall not have any factitious help from us on account of our connection with you; we will wash our hands of all patronage or countenance of slavery, as far as it is in the power of men to do it." Then when we had said thus far, we would have added, "We do not mean to invade your own territory and disturb the institution where it exists. We do not mean to infringe constitutional law one single whit. We mean to do what the sun does, when it stands over against mountains of ice and they melt. But that moral force may have any beneficial effect, it is necessary that slavery should abide where it is. It must not travel farther. Its roots must have no more soil. If you take the nomadic Arabs and preach the gospel to them on horseback, they will run away from you; you cannot preach as fast as they can ride. But if these nomads will pitch their tents, and become stationary, you may then hope to civilize and Christianize them. If slavery were allowed to go to New-Mexico and to California, we cannot overtake it with the gospel; but the moment we can anchor the institution, the moment we can establish bulwarks and lines of demarkation about it, that very moment you have a place where you can with brotherly affection begin to kill it, and we will do it too with the sword of the Spirit and with the truth of God. We mean not to violate the spirit of Christianity nor even of courtesy in speaking as we do; we mean to preach the great doctrine of Christ, the great truths of God's liberty in the North, and if they will hold still in the South, we will overtake them with it. We will make slavery a burden to their conscience, and a burden to their pockets, as it is a burden to God's patience. But, it seemed as if the land were never to have rest, there came along these agitators. Oh! these agitators, these agitators! If we could only find out who they were. But there *have* been agitators! We might have had free intercourse with the South. We might have preached our ideas to them, and they might have preached their ideas to us. We hoped the day would come when there could be this kind of traffic, and our heads could trade with their heads; then we would have the hip-lock of them, and we would throw them. But no, it seemed as if the Devil could not stay peaceably in hell. He is now, just as he always was, wandering up and down to see what he can do. He went to Washington; I fear that he has been there a great many times; when he put himself into the shape of the Fugitive Slave Law, he overvaulted his ambition and fell on the other side. I will venture to say that nothing has happened since this nation was founded that has made such a gulf between the North and the South as the passing of this Fugitive

Slave Law. (Loud applause.) Let me state some of the reasons why I think so, and why I am opposed to the Law. First, I am opposed to the Fugitive Slave Law on account of the inhumanity of the thing itself. If it was simply taking a man held to service back to poor fare, poor clothes, poor lodging and hard work, well, for the sake of the Union, (Ahem! ahem!!) I would do even that. I love the Union. I do not give up even to those dry nurses of the Union, the Union Safety Committee. (Cheers and laughter.) I profess that I am as much of a patriot as they are. How can I send back a man to a system which denies his humanity—which ranks him with the brutes, where it is a penitentiary offense to teach him to read, where he has no religious ministry appointed for him? To take a man who has just struggled up to the free North, who has long thought of liberty, who has offered up his thanks to God that he was to be free at last, who has but just reached the shores of freedom; to take that man back again and plunge him into the waves of bondage, where bondage means damnation—that is what they ask the Christian Church to do, and that is what they ask me to instruct my people to do! For refusing it, we are pronounced disorganizers; and when we plead conscience, religious newspapers jeer; and when we appeal to a higher law of humanity and of God, even ministers of the gospel are found denouncing the idea, that in such deeds there can be any higher law than that of Congress!

On this point we are met by the New Testament and the case of Paul and Onesimus; and we are told that the apostle Paul sent back men into slavery. Into such a slavery as a brother beloved, and in such a way, viz., by his own free consent, I should not object to return fugitives. There are two ways of sending men back into slavery. Paul took one way and Marshal Devens and Commissioner Somebody, in New-York, took another way. Let us look at these two ways. Paul preached the gospel to the man whom he returned to slavery. Now I should like to see the Marshals go and preach the gospel to a slave of their catching, and get down on their knees and pray with him and read him the Confession of Faith. (Laughter.) Then, secondly, Paul wrote a letter and sent the man back by himself—he did not ask any officer to attend him; and when he got back his master opened the letter and read, "I return him to you a brother, and as such receive him from me." Now, rather than to see this sweet and precious Union dissolved, I would accept this method of sending men back into slavery; I would arrest a fugitive and write a letter to his master in the South, make him carry it himself, and say, "I return him to you as a brother." How he would look when he got back there, standing up in his master's presence smiling with his bright ebony face, and saying, "How do you do, my brother? and how do you do, my sister?" (Loud and repeated applause.) Oh, how I wish that our venerable doctors—and we are told that they are old and wise men—I believe that no one could read their sermons without soon discovering that they are old—very old; yet I have a great respect and reverence for them, in spots—(Laughter)—I wish that they would practise the example of Paul's treatment of Onesimus. I maintain that these men should have the Epistle of Paul republished by the Tract Society, as they have been publishing the Proverbs of Solomon, and put it in their pockets and go South with some of these Simses and Henry Longs. Let it be understood that no master is to have his runaway slave, who will not receive him as a "BROTHER," and that no fugitive slave is to be sent back upon compulsion, but only such as are willing to go of themselves; and then we should have the Pauline practice.

The first reason, therefore, why I object to the Fugitive Slave Law, is, that it compels me to do what I am taught to be a sin by their own favorite Bible-texts. If it is wrong to send back Dr. Pennington, then it is wrong to send back Sims and Long. Is it right to send back this beloved brother, Dr. Pennington, who is a slave unrequited, who very likely would be sent back if he should resume his pastoral duties here, and who is wind-bound abroad, as the winds of oppression will not let him come home?

It would be just as right to send him back as it was Sims and Long, and you are just as much in duty bound to send one as another. Would you send him back into slavery? (A voice, "I would for one." Another voice, "I would for two." Another, "I would for three.") Would any man in his senses send him back? (Great applause and laughter.)

But I remark, secondly, in respect to this Fugitive Slave Law, I am amazed at it because it is so utterly unfit to carry out its own principles. In the first place, the Fugitive Slave Law cannot return the fugitives of the South. It has not returned, and cannot and will not return one per cent. of them. The old law did not, neither will the new. You may not know there is an underground railroad in New-York. I

hear of it, though I am not a conductor on it, and I venture to say that there are forty men coming through it from the South, where there has been one carried back. The old law—of which it may be said that it was weak through the flesh—could not stop this. I think about the old law as I think about fishing. My father is a good fisherman, and he can catch more fish with a pin hook and an old stick for a pole, than I can with a fly hook, a brass-feruled cane rod, and all the other scientific appurtenances of the art. Now when a community are prepared to arrest a fugitive and send him back into slavery, the old law, although it is an old alder pole and pin hook, is good enough to catch them with; but now you have one of those bright silver-jointed rods and fly hooks and other fixings, and you won't catch one single fish or fugitive more than you did with your old tackle. The trouble lies not in the old law, but in the public sentiment of the community where you are fishing. Suppose a man is taken sick with the cholera and the doctors should give a dose of medicine to his horse, would the man get any better? The sickness lies in the community, and you have been dosing the law. The law does not need any medicine.

I object, thirdly, to the Fugitive Slave Law, because it serves to irritate an evil which was already bad enough. It stirs up ill blood between the North and the South, and it seems to me there never was a bill framed by Congress better calculated in all its tendencies to do so. I recollect of once hearing an old clergyman describe a young minister as one who "preached as though the devil was in him. He takes the promises of the Bible and throws them out with a pitchfork;" and so the last Congress has thrown out its enactments with a pitchfork. This whole law is a disgrace to them and to us. I object to it, then, because it abridges very much, at least brings into danger, the essential liberties of freemen. Such has been the panic and the sense of danger during the winter past that thousands of men, women, and children, peacefully engaged at their various occupations, have been driven hither and thither, scattered like partridges on the mountains when the sound of the hunter was upon them. We little realize the terror that was stricken through the hearts of its victims when this law was enacted. They trembled in view of consequences, of being arrested and brought before men who were promised ten dollars if they convicted them, but only five if they cleared them.

But, not only does this bill, which is so odious, endanger the interests of free citizens, but it comes to me and says, "Henry Ward Beecher, if the sheriff calls upon you to seize that man, you must do it." It comes to me and says, "That poor woman who came to your door last night, and whom you took into your house, knowing her to be a slave, you must give up to me." He puts his grip on me, and I must be fined or incarcerated because I gave her bread and water. Let a man act under such an official character as that, let him put me under a penalty for obeying Christ's law, and then let me meet him in the day of judgment if he dare! No, it is bad enough that they go against the Constitution and violate the well-understood sentiment that existed when that Constitution was made; it is bad enough that the Constitution stands so far warped and bent as it does; but when it comes down to the citizens of this country and says to them, "You are bound to obey this law in this way; you are bound to help if called upon; you are forbidden to harbor or feed the fugitive," God do so to me and more also, if when a man comes to me weary, dusty, and far spent with travel, I do not help him freedomward! (Cheers.)

I say to the South and to her politicians, that the true course of Christian policy should have been to allay and not to increase the strife between the North and the South. It was their duty to have avoided all cause of irritation on this subject; it was their duty to have acted more in accordance with the spirit of Christian love; and it was our duty, too, to have avoided all cause for irritation for the sake of the Union. When that law passed, against the known moral sentiment of the North, it was bombarding the North; it was the artillery of the South aimed directly at us, park after park; and the cannoneer was one who should never have been found firing against his own hearthstone.

Fellow-citizens, a few years ago there was a man who, in a speech at Nible's Garden, declared as only such a man as he can declare—for it is not given to one age to see more than one Webster—"that they who attempted to trespass upon the religious feeling of the North on the subject of slavery, had not considerably weighed what that feeling was;" and he warned the South against such a course, as one which would inevitably shake the stability of the Union. O Lucifer! son of the morning, how art thou fallen, thou who wast a prophet, but who hast forgotten thine own predictions, and done the very thing that with a voice of inspiration thou warnest others not to do! I remember when almost I revered that man; and I think for stature of understanding, for mighty genius as a statesman, no man in this land, and

since the death of Peel, no man in any land, is his equal. I would not speak harshly of Daniel Webster; I would not, like Shimei, cast stones at him; I would rather go backwards as did the reverent children of Noah, and put a cloak over his nakedness. But when I hear him eulogized in the street, in the papers, and in the pulpit, and am made to step over him, and to walk around him, and to meet him at every turn, much as I look up to that great man—and I am proud of him as a New-Englander—much as I think of him, yet there is something even dearer to me than this great statesman of America. Liberty is dearer, truth is dearer, religion and humanity are dearer. (Applause.)

I object to the Fugitive Slave Law, because it aims a deadly blow at respect for all law; for I think that bad laws are treason to good governments; that the legislature that enacts a bad law knocks out one stone from the foundation of the governmental fabric. There is no doubt whatever that more influence is exerted by one bad law, towards promiscuous disobedience of all law, than can be repaired by a generation.

I object to the law on account of its sequences, on account of the influences it is developing; for so it is that, as one lie begets half a dozen, as one wrong will bring a retinue of wrongs in its train, and one false principle brings after it a score of false principles, so this law brings in its train a host of disastrous sequences; and first and foremost among these is one that I have mentioned, this impotent phantasm of a Union Committee—men who read a ledger for their duty, and feel in their pockets for their conscience. (Laughter.)

I object to this law still farther, because it has brought into vogue a style of reasoning and an advocacy of principles, which if believed and carried out will destroy the foundations of civil government. The time, I trust, is past when we shall hear, as we lately have heard, men in the pulpits—blind men leading the blind—crying out for lower law; and men ordained to preach God's law, ridiculing higher law and venting their injured sensibilities against rival denominations, taking this occasion to send poisoned arrows at them; mixing up private wrongs with public grievances. Not long since, we heard abundant eloquence expended to prove that the citizen was obliged to obey the laws of the land, and that this was obeying God; that legislators being ordained of God, when the Government enacted any thing it was the duty of the citizen to obey. A law so enacted was to be his Pope—and more than Pope—it was to be his Jesus Christ, his Jehovah, and he was to obey it and bow down to it; and at the pretense "higher law" and a sensitive conscience, there was ridicule and reproach. This doctrine is only the old theory that prevailed in the time of King James. It is only revamping their puerile policy, and bringing their old exploded doctrines down to this day for the government of this Republic; and if that doctrine is to recover itself and to receive any patronage, if that is to be the doctrine of our land, there is no chance for a permanent Republic here. Why is it that France has so long struggled and striven for a republic, and has never grasped it? Why is it that Italy has asked for a republic and has never been able to get it? Why is it that Hungary has been longing to establish a republic? It is because the common people have been trodden down and not educated, and been taught by their schoolmasters and ministers and legislators that it was their duty to give up their conscience to the magistrate and the priest: and, therefore, there was no foundation upon which to build a republic. You might as well attempt to build a custom-house like that in Wall street on cotton wool. The material for a republic is too soft; man there is pithy, porous, spongy, flabby, and must remain so until you put the stuff of conscience into him and make him independent in his moral sense. The man that digs coal in this country, the man that tinkers my kettle, the man that sews my shoe, I, not a whit more than he, can stand up and say, "God, thou art my Father; there is none on earth between me and Thee!" The noblest thing that God ever made and gave to man, was his conscience! Our fathers educated us to use that conscience in spite of authority civil or ecclesiastical. It made New-England. Her sons were trained to regard conscience as more sacred than any thing else. A nation based upon conscience, has, like New-England, a substratum of granite, while a nation without a conscience is like the sand of the sea-shore upon which you cannot build. Now, if you wish to be like South America, like France, like Italy, and those other poverty-stricken nations, then give heed to these seducing priests and to those apostate statesmen who tell you that your conscience is to be given up to the Government, and that you are not to regard its monitions. But I tell you, God will hold you in judgment if you do not have consciences upon so great a question of humanity, and if, then, you do not heed them.

Now, this hateful law, framed in iniquity for the sake of perpetuating iniquity,

has been suicidal to liberty. I think that while many have given adhesion to it from party reasons, and many more have assented to it from commercial reasons, I thank God that it is not the doctrine of the country, it is not the doctrine of New-York State, of Connecticut, of Rhode-Island, of Massachusetts, of New-Hampshire, of Maine, of Vermont, of Michigan, of Ohio, of Indiana, of Wisconsin, nor of Iowa; and I think that time will show, and that ere long, all the States north of Mason and Dixon's line, and I may fain hope of Kentucky and Tennessee too,—I believe that time will show that this doctrine, hateful alike to God and man, is repudiated by the common sense of a well-educated people; and that the time will come when no greater disgrace can be written upon a tomb-stone as epitaph, than "Here lies A. B., author of a commentary and treatise designed to show that conscience must be given up to the magistrate, the legislator and the priest!" Everybody will read it, and exclaim, "God have mercy upon his poor soul!"

I have attempted to speak that which I believed to be true. It may appear exaggerated to you; but I believe it. I have said things to awaken your own thought, and all I ask is, that you will lay the truth to heart and think upon this subject in the light of eternity, with the Bible in your hands, conscious that God looks upon you. Think of it as Christian men, as patriots; and if you will think of t, the end of my speaking is gained.

REV. DR. WILLIS, of Toronto, President of the Anti-Slavery Society of Canada, next addressed the audience. He regarded this Society, he said, as one of the most interesting of those which held their anniversaries this week, and he rejoiced that the tide of moral sentiment is in the direction in which he saw it going so nobly and so triumphantly. He felt honored in being deputed to attend this anniversary in this great and noble city, and was happy to say that there was no body of men associated for religious and benevolent purposes, with whom he had a deeper sympathy than those convened on this occasion. Although he could not address the audience as fellow-citizens literally, yet he could address them as brothers and sisters belonging, with himself, to one great Republic, and friends to the anti-slavery cause, which called for the sympathies of every true-hearted man. He had been accustomed to say he was proud of British America, because it annihilates the distinction between master and slave. He would now say, he rejoiced in the feeling here manifested, and could go home and say he was proud of New-York, and could wish that this meeting might be regarded as a representation of the whole country, and the sentiments that have here been uttered, as the sentiment of the entire nation.

He said he trusted that nearly every person in the vast assembly was animated by the same feeling: a deep sympathy in favor of the oppressed and against oppression. The people of Canada, in the exercise of the most friendly feelings, deeply sympathize with the efforts making for the emancipation of the slaves in this country, by moral instrumentality. He was rejoiced to hear what had been said in favor of freedom by his reverend friend who had addressed the meeting, and thankful for the information obtained in regard to the attitude taken by so many of the Christian Church of this Union. But he regretted exceedingly to hear that the Church generally is not lifting up its voice, as audibly as it might, against slavery. Why, he could not have said what has been said here to-day before an English assembly without meeting with incredulity, for they would

scarcely believe that there was so much fault existing here in the ministry and the churches.

"The Bible is not against slavery, but against the *abuse* of it," is the language used by many; and "if Christianity is left to exert its ameliorating influences, it will soon put an end to slavery." Such language has often been used with reference to other enormities. Should not those who use it consider that their interpretations of the law may be wrong, and that they do not sufficiently evolve the morals that are applicable in this department of ethics? He went on to enlarge upon what the last speaker had said upon the subject of Hebrew servitude. He agreed with him substantially, though he was not prepared to concede quite so much with reference to the practice under the Mosaic code. The Hebrews were forbidden, it is allowed by our opponents, to enslave their brethren; but now, the difference between the Jews and Gentiles having been done away, ALL MEN ARE OUR BRETHREN. The distinction made between Jew and Gentile is, he believed, of no validity whatever. He maintained also that the Bible did not recognize the relation of slaveholder and slave. Slavery is a violation of nature and the fundamental principles of morality and religion. When this point is conceded by the Christian churches in this land, we of Canada, said he, will love you better. He would not sit down, he said, without assuring the meeting that he should represent the public feeling of his own country, when he said, that while they lamented the necessity of so many victims of slavery flying to their territory, driven by the late oppressive law, they would not see them cast out and driven back into bondage, but would extend to them all needed protection and succor. On this subject, he said, we ought to feel that we are all of one nation.

Rev. CHARLES G. FINNEY was next introduced. He said that many years had elapsed since he had been in New-York to attend the anniversary of this Society. For nearly two years he had been in Europe. He had not been indifferent to the struggle here on the subject of slavery. He had kept his eyes and ears open, and his heart alive, and had felt deeply, as might be supposed, in view of the transactions the last year, especially in view of the passage of that—what should he call it?—he could not call it a *law*, for he did not believe it was a law—the Fugitive Slave Bill. He would detain the audience, only to state what he supposed to be the views entertained in England, and in Europe generally, with reference to it. While it was under discussion, he could not believe that it would be enacted. When he heard it had passed, he was astonished. Questions were put to him like these: What will the North do with it? What effect will it have in the free States? Will it be the means of dividing the Union? Will the North obey it? Will the ministers and the churches at the North submit to it? Will it not produce rebellion and civil war? What will be done? He gave it

as his opinion, that the North would not resist it by violence, but that as a general, if not a universal thing, they would not aid in executing it, and that they would try all constitutional means to get rid of it.

He said that when it was stated that several of the ministers at the North preached in favor of sustaining the law, he was put to the blush, and asked in what sense do they sustain it? He told them he supposed they preached that the people should not rebel, but wait and seek to remove the bill by legislation. But when he arrived in this country, not only did he understand that ministers had preached what his brother Beecher represented them to have preached, but that they proclaimed the law to be just and constitutional, and consequently entitled to the unanimous support of the people of the North. He said, he was ashamed to have it known in England, that ministers in this country preached that God had delivered to the civil authorities the power to legislate for the consciences of men, and that individual consciences must be governed by the law of the country. He had no conception that Northern ministers would preach any such thing; he had been shocked at such a doctrine as this. He supposed that the united voice of the North would be, "It is unconstitutional and contrary to the law of God; we will not aid in executing it; we will rid ourselves of it as soon as possible."

He thought people abroad were better qualified to judge of the matter than those in the midst of the excitement, who were driven, as it were, to take one side or the other, especially if they be American citizens. There are two classes in England who are watching these movements with great interest. The monarchists are chuckling with the idea that our government will explode, and that they will then be able to say, "There, you can see how the American government has turned out with its democracy!" But there is a very large class who are tremblingly alive to this question, and are looking at it from another point of view. They sympathize with Northern citizens in their desire to get rid of the law, and dread the idea of this government exploding. They pray earnestly that the matter may be adjusted, that this Union may not be rent asunder, and that God will give wisdom to those who are acting in this matter. He said that one man who felt deeply on the subject said to him, "I regard the establishment of the American government as the greatest event that has occurred since the invention of printing." This man spoke very feelingly of the danger that now threatens this country. The serious politicians of England have often expressed sorrow to me, said Mr. F., at the tone of discussing this subject in Congress. They have looked at it with pain, and have been afraid that it would result in anarchy, bloodshed, and finally in despotism, and thus destroy the hopes of the world. But, he said, if the prayers of the good people of England can be of avail, all the difficulties now existing will result in good.

Mr. Finney said he wished that all who are opposed to the law would

recollect, that English Christians feel deeply interested in this subject, and although they can have no political influence, they have an influence they can carry to the Throne of Grace. They are now praying for this Society, for the abolition of slavery, that God would direct the Congress of the United States, that truth may prevail, and this country be saved. He said there was a strong under-current in this country, and throughout the world, that would result in the overthrow of slavery, and seal the fate of the slave power. Meantime he could say, as Mr. Beecher had said, and he thought it would be the general feeling of Christians, let no one engage in the execution of the accursed law, but seek every constitutional method of casting it away, and blotting it out of existence.

Mr. F. went on to say, that he was amazed that the abominable doctrine should be inculcated from the pulpit, that the legislature can control the consciences of the men of this country, or ought to control them; that God has delivered the power of legislation over the conscience into the hands of a few men, to enact laws in direct defiance of His law, and that in fact repeal His law. If human legislation can in any case repeal God's law, and make enactments contrary to His law obligatory and binding upon men, then they can in all cases; if God's legislation can be set aside by the legislation of man, then we might invoke human legislation to repeal all moral laws at once, and make the law of selfishness the law of God; and thus men might dispose of all sin, and have a short-hand method of abolishing it. What sin could there be in the world under this doctrine? It would eternally be made lawful for man to steal, and violate the most sacred obligations; it would be a summary method of getting rid of the duty of repentance; a summary plan of ridding the world of moral depravity. But who, said he, can believe this?

The whole land, he thought, the moment the bill was passed, should have cried out, as they sometimes do in England at public meetings, when any thing is said or done offensive to the audience: Shame! shame!! shame!!! If the whole land had cried Shame! at the time when the Fugitive Slave Bill was enacted, men would not have stood up in the pulpit, and either advocated that law, or inculcated the duty of obeying it.

The resolutions were then adopted; and the meeting, after an animated and highly satisfactory session of three hours, was adjourned to meet for discussion and business, May 7th, at 9 o'clock A. M.

Annual Report.

SLAVERY continues to be the great question of the day. Its downfall was foreseen by the founders of this government. The sagacious Jefferson, in referring to the slaves of this country, said: "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate, than that these people are to be free."* It is the present sentiment of the civilized world. Demagogues, wrong-headed statesmen and deluded expositors of Scripture may retard the great work of emancipation, but the glorious issue is as certain as the existence of the sun in the firmament.

The annual review of the anti-slavery cause, which we now propose to take, although it furnishes much to mortify the true-hearted descendants of the men who began the settlement of this country, and the patriots who founded the government under which we live, exposes to our view nothing that should, on reflection, dishearten the friends of liberty. Alternations of hope and fear, of success and defeat, are connected with every moral enterprise, and are like the transit of a ship over the ocean, which, notwithstanding its devious path, arrives ultimately at its destination. Confiding, then, in the overruling providence of God, the down-trodden slave may exclaim, "Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy; when I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me." And the friends of the slave may, in view of what has been done in this righteous cause, and the prospect before them, thank God and take courage.

The compromise measures, mentioned in our last Annual Report, as being introduced into the Senate of the United States by Mr. Clay, were, after a protracted debate and vigorous opposition, substantially adopted by both houses of Congress. The originator of this project, and his adherents, boasted that its consummation would result in the pacification of the country, as to this great topic; that the Hotspurs of the South would no longer threaten disunion, nor the Abolitionists of the North continue

the agitation of the slavery question. They must be satisfied by the events which have since transpired, that their prophecies are not likely to be fulfilled.

The acts embraced provisions for the admission of California as a free State; for pacifying Texas by a gift of ten million dollars from the national treasury, and at least ninety thousand square miles of territory taken from New-Mexico; forming New-Mexico and Utah into Territories, to be admitted hereafter as States, with or without slavery, as their inhabitants shall decide; for the abolition of the slave-trade *into* the District of Columbia; and for the recovery of fugitive slaves.

The enactment of these bills was another triumph of the Slave Power. The people of California, by their own act, had decided that slavery should not be admitted. The "compromise," then, for the settlement of the difficulty between the slavery and liberty divisions of the United States, consisted, on the one part, in depriving New-Mexico of a large share of her territory and annexing it to Texas, to be hereafter formed into a slave State; in holding out a temptation to the slavery division to establish slavery in the States to be hereafter formed out of the Territories of New-Mexico and Utah; in giving an immense sum of money, an act that may serve as a precedent, to stop the unfounded claims and treasonable threats of a slaveholding State; in making the territory of all the free States a hunting-ground for fugitive slaves, and requiring the free people of these States to afford their aid in their reclamation; and on the other hand, abolishing the slave-trade in the District of Columbia.* A compromise truly!

The most insulting and pernicious of these acts was the Fugitive Slave Bill. It passed the Senate by a vote of 27 yeas and 12 nays, there being only eight more than a quorum present. Only two Senators from the free States were found to vote for it,† while no less than twenty-one members from various States were absent, or silent, when the vote was taken on the engrossment of the bill. In the House of Representatives the bill was forced through without discussion, or any opportunity for amendment. A representative from a free State‡ was selected to move the *previous question*. On the question, "SHALL THIS BILL PASS?" the vote was 109 yeas and 75 nays. Among the yeas were thirty members from the free States! Not less than forty-eight members were absent or declined voting. Several Northern members who did not dare to vote for the bill, and had not sufficient moral principle or courage to vote against

* This bill does not touch the relation of slavery as it exists in the District; it does not prevent the sale of slaves to be transported out of the District; it simply prohibits the importation of slaves as merchandise into the District, and authorizes the corporations of Washington and Georgetown to break up depots of slaves so imported.

† Messrs. A. C. Dodge and George W. Jones, of Iowa.

‡ James Thompson, of Pennsylvania.

it, "dodged" the question. Eleven members, FREE-SOILERS, who had opposed all measures for the extension or support of slavery, during the whole session, were, of course, among the nays. The Representatives from the free States numbered 141, while the number from the slave States was only 91. The former, therefore, had they all voted, could have killed the bill.* A tremendous responsibility rests upon them!

The President of the United States, it appears, hesitated about approving the bill, and did not sign it until after he had required the written opinion of the Attorney-General, who is a slaveholder, that it was constitutional. Before his elevation to this high office, by the death of General Taylor, Mr. Fillmore had, in his native State, publicly declaimed against the encroachments of the Slave Power, and maintained that they must be resisted.* And yet, on the first opportunity that presented itself, he succumbed to this power!

Forty-four members of Congress, of different political parties, and from various States, North and South, formed a "Union League," in which they pledged themselves not to vote for any man, even for a member of a State Legislature, who is not an advocate and upholder of the compromise measures. The list is headed by Henry Clay, the originator of the compromise. New-England furnished but one signer to the pledge, of any party;† who also voted for the Fugitive Slave Bill, but has lost his re-election. Only eight of the New-York members signed it—less than one fourth of her delegation. Only two of these have been re-elected. Pennsylvania furnished but one signer,‡ and there were only eleven signers in all the free States.

That portion of the merchants in New-York who trade largely with the South, not to be wanting in patriotism, took measures to have a "Union Meeting," composed of traders and politicians of various parties. At this meeting, it so happened that all the speakers were political law-

* In addition to other evidence at hand, we subjoin a letter written by President Fillmore, to an officer of an Anti-Slavery Society:—

BUFFALO, Oct. 17, 1838.

SIR:—Your communication of the 15th instant, as chairman of a committee appointed by the 'Anti-Slavery Society of the County of Erie,' has just come to hand. You solicit my answer to the following interrogatories:

1st. Do you believe that petitions to Congress, on the subject of slavery and the slave trade, ought to be received, read, and respectfully considered by the representatives of the people?

2d. Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to this nation, under any circumstances, so long as slaves are held therein?

3d. Are you in favor of Congress exercising all the constitutional power it possesses to abolish the internal slave-trade between the States?

4th. Are you in favor of immediate legislation for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia?

I am much engaged, and have no time to enter into an argument, or to explain at length my reasons for my opinion. I shall, therefore, content myself, for the present, by answering all your interrogatories in the affirmative, and leave, for some future occasion, a more extended discussion of the subject.

MILLARD FILLMORE.

† Samuel A. Elliott, of Boston.

‡ Senator Cooper.

yers. The Abolitionists of the country were denounced, the compromise measures were applauded, and the people throughout the country were called upon to put an end to slavery agitation. At this meeting a "UNION SAFETY COMMITTEE" was appointed, consisting of ONE HUNDRED PERSONS, who were charged with the duty of carrying out, by correspondence and otherwise, the objects of the meeting. The proceedings were published in pamphlet form and distributed throughout the country, with the signatures attached of those who were said to have signed the call for the meeting.* Similar meetings were gotten up at other places, and resolutions of the same import were passed.

It was sanguinely hoped by the merchants and clergymen, as well as by the politicians in the "cotton" interest,† that the measures taken in Congress, and at metropolitan meetings, and by conservative divines, would allay agitation on the engrossing subject of slavery, at least on the part of all opposed to slavery; that the anti-slavery agitators would be overawed and silenced; that the Slave Power would be permitted to have its own way without molestation; and that the cry would be heard throughout the land of "Peace—Peace." But Leviathan is not so tamed.

It was soon found that the South intended to test the sincerity of the North, which had been represented, by that portion of its members of Congress who had voted for the compromise as willing to sustain it to "the fullest extent—to the fullest extent." Well knowing that the people of the free States were smarting under the indignity of having their honored citizens rudely repulsed, while seeking amicably to vindicate the rights of colored seamen in Southern ports; that thus one of the provisions of the Constitution was set at defiance by the States now clamorous for the reclamation of fugitive slaves; and that the people of the North felt keenly the novel and iniquitous features of the Fugitive Slave Bill they seemed determined to carry its infamous provisions into effect, in order that the South might still farther humble the North, and exhibit to the world the triumphs and despotism of the slavocracy. If, thought they, the soil of the free States can be trampled upon by the pursuers of fugitive slaves; if Northern eyes and hearts can be familiarized

* To this call were attached several thousand signatures. The same name was repeated in numerous instances: in addition to the signature of the firm, the names of the several partners were generally subscribed; in some instances five or six clerks in a single establishment were added; and the number of signatures was thus swelled to give an imposing air to the document, and persuade the people in the country that the leading merchants of New-York were in favor of the "peace" measures of the last session of Congress.

† Some of these clergymen were inveigled into becoming sincere supporters of this interest, it is hoped and believed, under a belief that the peace of the country was actually in danger. Unfortunately for them, the same prefix attaches to their names as has been fastened to those of the merchants and politicians who misled them. Henceforth, Cotton Preachers will be as familiar a term as Cotton Merchants or Cotton Politicians.

with the scenes daily witnessed in the land of slavery; especially if the citizens of those States can be compelled to aid slaveholders, agreeably to the provisions of this act, in the recapture of their victims, the great question will be forever settled; we shall be, without dispute, a slaveholding nation, and the North, with its extensive population and wealth, and its superiority in political power, will forever be to us "hewers of wood and drawers of water."

The passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill emboldened slaveholders, their heirs and representatives, to employ agents, enter into correspondence, and take unwonted measures for the reclamation of fugitives who had recently escaped, and also of those who at periods long past had found their way into the free States. This Bill revived not only hopes of gain, but a desire to exercise authority, if not vengeance, upon those who had long been supposed by both parties to be free from molestation.

Among the advertisements put forth respecting runaways was the following:—

CATCH THE MINISTER!

\$250 for any one who will catch a METHODIST PREACHER!!

\$250 REWARD.

Ran away from the subscriber, living near Jefferson, Frederick county, Maryland, a negro man, who calls himself Lloyd Smuthers, of about 22 years of age. he is about five feet nine or ten inches high, of a yellow complexion, and has a down, sly look, a round face, and short nose. When spoken to, he generally smiles before replying, and speaks smoothly. He had on, when he left, a blue coat, white hat with a black scarf on it, and a pair of blue pants, and took no clothing with him except what he had on, that is known. *He belongs to a Methodist church, and pretends to be a preacher.* He took the western stage on the 20th of November, from the other side of Middleton, and was seen afterwards in Hagerstown; he has a brother-in-law living near Harrisburg, named Ben Russell.

The above reward will be given if taken out of the State, and secured so that I can get him, or \$150 if taken within the State.

JACOB RIDGELY,

Near Jefferson, Md., acting for Ruth Ridgely.

In most instances, the arrest of fugitives has not been preceded by such announcements; but the agents of slaveholders, after correspondence with persons of a like stamp in the free States, have stealthily seized their victims, and brought them before the men who have sold themselves to be Commissioners, under the infamous Fugitive Bill, with a view, in the language of this law, of instituting a "summary" process, and hurrying the doomed man into a slave State before the sympathy of an indignant community can be aroused.

A case speedily occurred. In eight days from the approval of the Bill by President Fillmore, the agent of Mary Brown arrived in New-York, from Baltimore, with a power of attorney and a copy of the act, certified by Daniel Webster, Secretary of State,* and applied to Alex-

* It may afford some satisfaction to the editor of the *Journal of Commerce*, to know that copies of the act, instead of being written or printed specially for such purposes, were cut out from that paper and certified by the Secretary of State, after the typographical errors had been corrected in the Department of State, for the use of slave-hunters, as they might be called for.

ander Gardiner, clerk of the Circuit Court for the Southern District of New-York, who was also a Commissioner, and by the Act constituted a high court, having concurrent jurisdiction with the Judges of the Circuit and District Courts of the United States, in term time and vacation, for a warrant to arrest James Hamlet, a mulatto, and member of the Methodist Church, who had resided near the city of New-York two or three years. The man was, after false statements had been made to him, arrested while pursuing his ordinary business, as porter in a store, and taken before the Commissioner, who proceeded, in a small, retired room, in hot haste, to take the testimony of the claimant and her son, with a view, as was apparent, of delivering him up, and allowing him to be sent into slavery, before a single acquaintance or even his family should be apprised of his arrest. Hamlet insisted that he was a free man, that he had entitled himself to his liberty, and denied that he was a slave. The law prohibited his testimony being taken, and the Commissioner, upon the testimony of the two family witnesses, delivered him up to the agent. He was immediately handcuffed, forced into a carriage, and taken by Benjamin H. Tallmadge, son of Henry F. Tallmadge, United States Marshal, and grandson of Col. Benjamin Tallmadge, who was an officer of the army of 1776 and subsequently a member of Congress, to Baltimore, where he was lodged in the notorious slave-prison lately belonging to Hope H. Slatter. The Deputy Marshal had no sooner lodged the distressed man in this well-known dungeon, than he made a telegraphic communication of his exploit to his father the Marshal. The wife and two children of poor Hamlet had no knowledge of his doom until he had been taken from the city, and were deprived of the mournful consolation of bidding him farewell! While the United States officers, the slaveholders and their abettors, were rejoicing in their achievement, the bereaved family were weeping over the desolation brought about in their humble dwelling.

The pro-slavery press of the city exulted over the procedure as "a vindication of the majesty of the law," although a large portion of the citizens felt ashamed of the deed. The sum of \$800 was soon raised for the redemption of Hamlet, a considerable part of it by the friends of the Bill, and he was restored to his family.

This Society immediately after published the Bill, with a history of its enactment, a classification of the names of those who voted for and against it, an argument on the unconstitutionality of the law, a statement of its infamous provisions, and an account of the seizure, enslavement and subsequent restoration of Hamlet. Three editions, 23,000 copies in all, were published and circulated throughout the country.*

The second fugitive slave case occurred in Philadelphia. A man

* A few hundred copies remain on hand, and can be had at cost on application to William Harned, No. 48 Beekman street, New-York city.

named Henry Garnett, who had, according to the statement of the claimant, been at large eight years, was arrested as the slave of one Thomas P. Jones, of Cecil county, Md. He was brought before Judge Grier, one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. He was attended by a Committee of the old "Pennsylvania Society for Promoting the Abolition of Slavery," of which *Benjamin Franklin* was the first President. Able counsel was employed by the Abolitionists to defend the prisoner. Witnesses were examined on behalf of the claimant. The Court decided that the party claiming had not taken the course prescribed by the Fugitive Act; that he had failed to make out even an *ex-parte* case; and that the prisoner had a right to a discharge. He was received outside of the building, by his colored friends, with shouts of exultation, and borne away in triumph. They afterwards held a densely crowded meeting at the Brick Wesley Church, where a set of resolutions was enthusiastically adopted, that would have done honor to the patriarchs of the American Revolution; two of which were as follows:—

Resolved, That we will hold up to the scorn of the civilized world that hypocrisy which welcomes to our shores the refugees from Austrian tyranny, and at the same time would send the refugees from American slavery back to a doom compared with which Austrian tyranny is mercy.

Resolved, That having already witnessed, to some extent, the cruel operations of this law; having felt such anguish as no language can describe in seeing the wife flying from her home and the embraces of her husband, and the husband compelled to fly from his wife and helpless children, to gain that security in the land of a Monarchy which they could not enjoy in this Republic; we ask, calmly and solemnly ask the American people, what have we done to suffer such treatment at your hands? And may we not, in the sight of that God with whom there is no respect of persons, appeal to your sense of justice and mercy to have this most cruel law repealed as soon as Congress shall re-assemble; and in the mean time may we not ask you to create, by all lawful means, such a public sentiment as shall render its operation upon us powerless?

Soon after, another fugitive slave case occurred in Philadelphia, Adam Gibson being the person arrested. The proceedings took place before Edward D. Ingraham, United States Commissioner. The claimant, William S. Knight, of Cecil county, Md., appeared by his agent George F. Alberti, with witnesses brought with him, who swore positively that the prisoner was the slave of Knight. William S. Pierce and David Paul Brown, Esqs., addressed the Commissioner in behalf of the defense with great ability and eloquence. Ingraham said that he had no doubt of the identity of the prisoner, and that he should send him to Maryland. The poor man was accordingly placed in the custody of twenty-five officers, headed by a Philadelphia police marshal, and taken to the depot, accompanied by a large crowd of citizens. From thence several officers conveyed him to Grey's Ferry, where he was placed in the keeping of three officers to be taken to Cecil county, Md. On arriving there, his alleged master, with honorable frankness, declared that he was not his slave. Adam Gibson was therefore permitted to return to his family. This case, and especially the conduct of the Commissioner, occasioned much sensation throughout the country.

In the month of December a man of color, named Henry Long, was arrested in the city of New-York, by virtue of a warrant issued by a pretended Commissioner named Charles M. Hall, who had resided in the city but two weeks, as clerk to Commissioner Gardiner, the person having the unenvied notoriety of being the first Commissioner exercising jurisdiction under the new Bill. Mr. Hall held his court in a small room, near the office of the United States Marshal, and the prisoner was brought before him, dressed in his white jacket and apron, having been arrested while in the act of attending as waiter at the Pacific Hotel. Intelligence of the event having been swiftly circulated, John Jay, Esq., the ever vigilant advocate of the oppressed, soon made his appearance, and with others who acted as friends or counsel of Henry, prevented a certificate being given by the pseudo-Commissioner.

The next morning the agent of the claimant appeared, attended by his counsel, Henry W. Western, Esq. A vigorous defense was made for about two weeks, the particulars of which we have not space to narrate. During this time, at a hearing before Judge Campbell of the Superior Court of the State of New-York, it was proved that Charles M. Hall was only a sham Commissioner, having derived his pretended authority from his employer, Commissioner Gardiner, and not from the Circuit Court, as by law provided. It was the obvious duty then of Judge Campbell to discharge the prisoner, and had he done so Henry Long might still have been a freeman. Instead of doing this, the Judge deferred the adjudication of the case, and meantime allowed the Marshal, who wrongfully held the prisoner, to retain him in his custody; so that when the counsel for the claimant, under the advice of his associate, George Wood, Esq., had abandoned the original process and instituted new proceedings before the District Court of the United States, the discharge of the prisoner and his re-arrest were simultaneous. Judge Andrew T. Judson, of Connecticut, acting for Judge Betts of this District, held the examination, and, after a long and able contest, surrendered the claimed fugitive, who was taken to Virginia and there sold at public auction to a negro trader, on condition that he should never be transferred to any one residing in a free State.*

Great excitement was produced in Boston, by an attempt to enforce the

* It should not be forgotten that Mr. George Wood was the presiding officer of the "Union Meeting," held at Cattle Garden, New-York, Oct. 30th, 1850; and that the Union Safety Committee appointed at said meeting gave him a fee of five hundred dollars to appear as counsel for the Virginia slaveholder, who claimed to be the master of Henry Long. And it will not be out of place to mention in this connection, that Mr. Henry W. Western, the associate of Mr. Wood in the prosecution, received from this or some similar source a piece of plate with a suitable inscription and a complimentary letter; and that Mr. Tallmadge, the United States Marshal, presented the Chief of the Police a fowling-piece, in testimony of his gratitude for the efficient aid that had been afforded by two or three hundred of the police of New-York, in guarding the person and in securing the safe delivery of Long on board the cars that conveyed him to the South.

Fugitive Law in that city. Two slave-hunters, Knight and Hughes, came to arrest William and Ellen Crafts, alleged to have escaped several years ago from slavery in Georgia. It will be recollected that these persons were the actors in a romantic enterprise, that resulted in their escape to a free State, which has been widely published throughout the country. They escaped in this wise. Ellen, who was of very light complexion, dressed herself in men's clothes, and acted the part of a young planter threatened with a consumption, going to the North to take medical advice. William, being a full-blooded black, enacted, on the route, the part of an old family servant, upon whom his young master leaned for support. In this way, taking the most public routes, and mixing with the most genteel travellers, on board steamboats and at hotels, they safely arrived at Boston. They had the benefit of legal advice from several of the most distinguished lawyers of the city. Crafts shut himself up in his house, being advised that the outer door could not be broken for the purpose of serving a warrant on civil process. Meantime, various technical objections were raised against the odious and unconstitutional statute, and the proceedings had under it. After a few weeks' trial all attempts to arrest them proved useless.

In February, an alleged fugitive slave named Shadrach was arrested by a United States Marshal in a coffee-house in Boston, and conveyed to the Circuit Court room, where a crowd of spectators speedily gathered. A warrant was issued by Commissioner George Ticknor Curtis, upon complaint of John Rupper, agent of John De Bree, of Norfolk, Va., a purser in the United States navy. Seth J. Thomas, Esq., appeared for claimant; S. E. Sewall, E. G. Loring, Esqs., and others for defendant. Sundry documents were read. They consisted of depositions taken before a United States Judge at Norfolk, to the effect that Shadrach was the slave of De Bree, and that he escaped on 3d May, 1850.

At the conclusion of the reading, the Commissioner postponed the further consideration of the case from Saturday till the next Tuesday. The court-room was then gradually cleared of its occupants, the prisoner remaining in the custody of the Deputy Marshal and his assistants. While his counsel were conferring with him, the stairway and the avenues of the court-house were crowded with a large collection of persons. About two o'clock, after the consultation of the attorneys with the prisoner had ceased, and they had all retired except one of them who was leaving the court-room, (which had been locked since the adjournment of the hearing, with several officers stationed at each door,) the door was forcibly thrown open by a band of colored men, who, with loud cries of "Tear him away!" filled the room and staircase to the number of a hundred or more. No adequate description, said a writer of a newspaper communication, can be given of the scene. The attack was so sudden that the officers had no time to gather round the prisoner, but were "kicked, cuffed, and knocked

about in every direction," and the prisoner was seized by the mob and carried off in triumph. The sword of the Marshal was taken from its place in the court-room, by a man of color, flourished over the heads of the crowd, and afterwards found lying in a gutter. No white person, it is believed, was engaged in the rescue, although one or more, besides several colored men, were afterwards arrested, indicted and held for trial.

A great outcry was made by the officials; the subject was brought by Mr. Clay before the Senate; the presses at Washington urged the Government to decisive action at the imminent crisis; and the President so far yielded to the clamor as to issue a proclamation, calling upon his fellow-citizens to rally, and commanding all officers, civil and military, in and near Boston, to assist in quelling unlawful combinations and in recapturing the "prisoner." This proclamation was given under the hand and seal of the President of the United States, Feb. 18, Anno Domini 1851; it was countersigned by Daniel Webster, Secretary of State, and sent to all parts of the country. But the prey had escaped, and found refuge in the dominions of the Queen of England. Sober-minded men, of different parties, marvelled that an Executive Proclamation, usually reserved for great emergencies, should have been promulgated on an occasion of this sort. It served, however, to show a portion of the South, that a Northern President might be depended on to subserve the interests of chattel slavery.

A more serious affair, connected with the Fugitive Slave Law, has recently transpired in the capital of Massachusetts. Thomas Sims, a man of color, was arrested as a fugitive. He made a stout resistance, and slightly wounded a city police officer, who was forward in arresting him. He was at last overpowered by the aid of a large posse of watchmen and taken to the court-house, where he passed the night, guarded by the Marshal, Gen. Devens, and several of his deputies. The prisoner was claimed by James Potter, of Chatham, Ga. The next day he was taken to the United States court-room, before Commissioner Curtis; Seth J. Thomas, Esq., appearing as counsel for claimant, and Hon. Robert Rantoul, Jr., Charles G. Loring and Samuel E. Sewall, Esqs., for the defendant. Witnesses were examined on the part of the claimant. At the request of the counsel for the defense, the case was adjourned till the next day.

Outside of the court-house there was much excitement; and around the building chains had been hung, inside of which a large number of police officers were stationed. As the Court of Common Pleas and the Supreme Court of the State were holding their terms, the Judges were compelled, in passing to and fro, to bow down under the chain:—a fit emblem of the humiliation of the free States at the present time. For several days the city was under great excitement, the prisoner remaining confined in the upper room of the court-house, the counsel making

strenuous efforts in his behalf, and Mayor Bigelow taking unusual measures to aid the claimant and his abettors, under pretense of preserving the peace of the city.

An affidavit of the prisoner was read, which stated that he had been free as long as he could remember. Application was made to the Supreme Court of the State for a writ of *Habeas Corpus*, which was peremptorily disallowed, on the ground that if a return should be made that he was held by the Marshal, by virtue of a warrant from the Commissioner, it must be considered as a sufficient return. A writ was afterwards allowed by Mr. Justice Woodbury, of the Supreme Court of the United States, who, on inquiring into the facts, dismissed the case, after making some "patriotic" remarks, which elicited the applause of the spectators. Messrs. Rantoul and Loring, with great power and eloquence, argued the unconstitutionality of the nefarious Bill.

Public meetings were held in Tremont Temple, during the day and evening of Tuesday, which were attended by highly respectable citizens, including many ladies. Addresses of great power and eloquence were made, and spirited resolutions were enthusiastically adopted. On Saturday, a mass meeting was held on Boston Common—Faneuil Hall and the State-House yard having been denied—at which several earnest speeches were made. On Sunday, the following request was sent to the clergymen of Boston and the vicinity, and in several instances was feelingly complied with:—

The undersigned, a freeman, and in peril, desires the prayers of this congregation, that God may deliver him from the oppressor, and restore him to freedom.

his
THOMAS M. SIMS.
mark.

The Commissioner finally decided to give a certificate. The next morning, the Marshal, with his deputies, and a large escort of police officers, conveyed the prisoner to a vessel manned by Northern seamen, lying at the end of Long Wharf, waiting to depart for Savannah. The Marshal, his deputies, &c., accompanied the vessel down the harbor, and several officers proceeded with the prisoner to Georgia.*

Some of the Boston merchants and manufacturers have been alarmed at a rumor that a portion of their trade with the South would be diverted to other cities in consequence of the anti-slavery agitation, and they have

* It was stated in the papers that the poor slave expressed entire willingness to return to the South, and that he even amused the company by singing,

"Oh, carry me back to Ole Virginny."

The same was said of the fugitive Henry Long, but we presume, as in this case, untruly. It is not an uncommon occurrence for slaveholders and their understrappers to compel slaves to sing for their amusement, or to make a mock exhibition of hilarity. "For those that carried us away captive, required of us a song; and they that wasted us, required of us mirth."

not got over their apprehensions that a modification of the tariff, promotive of their interests, will not be made, as they had been led to expect from the adroit intimations made by Mr. Webster in his communications to them, previously to his acceptance of the office of Secretary of State. It is their policy, therefore, to keep up an appearance of patriotic zeal for the "compromises of the Constitution" and the "rights" of the Southern States, and to be regardful of the policy of the present administration. Similar threats of the withdrawal of trade have been made with regard to New-York, to check anti-slavery tendencies among the merchants of that city. But those who utter these threats, as well as those alarmed by them, forget that trade has fixed laws, and that natural advantages in the hands of enterprise and integrity always insure profitable and desirable trade. Even were it otherwise, it would seem as if the "merchant princes" of our great cities might sacrifice a portion of their gains, rather than put their principles into the market. The example of John Hancock should not be forgotten.

Other cases of arrest have occurred in different States, all serving to render the Fugitive Bill abhorrent to good men, its authors and abettors the subjects of the contempt and indignation of the community, and slavery, its legitimate parent, the deserved object of execration.

These cruel proceedings under the Bill produced, as might have been anticipated, consternation on the part of the people of color, and indignation on that of the friends of humanity. Colored citizens were alarmed because their liberty was jeopardized, and the fugitives scattered up and down the free States were terrified beyond measure. Some had married and were happily settled; some were, by hard labor, supporting aged relatives; others were attending sick wives or children. The practical application of the law upon one deemed to be a free man, justly alarmed those who had been born in free States, and who were liable to be sworn into slavery at any time; and the poor man, once a slave, who had thought himself secure, after living so long in a free State, felt himself obliged, as winter was setting in, to abandon his home, leave his family in indigence and distress, and flee for refuge to a colder clime, but beneath the ægis of a so-called monarchical government.

We might relate instances of individual suffering among the young, the sick, and the aged, that should melt even hearts of stone.* Their sorrows are chronicled in heaven, and will be revealed at the judgment-day.

* A correspondent of the *Tribune* writes from Trenton, N. J., as follows:—"A melancholy effect of the infernal Fugitive Slave Law has just occurred here. Two or three evenings since, it became rumored among the blacks that slave-catchers were in town. The fear is very prevalent among that class, and, indeed, is well grounded, that any one of them may be taken away, by purchased affidavits; consequently they are all in much alarm. One man, on hearing the above rumor, named William Gordon, a very decent colored man, became so much excited by fright, that it threw him in a state of paralysis, of which he died this morning. When will the North be roused? When, oh! when will there be 'a North?'"

"For the needy shall not always be forgotten; the expectation of the poor shall not perish forever."

Instances have occurred of the dispersion of almost entire churches. From the *Evening Post* we extract the following:—

The Baptist Colored church at Buffalo has suffered a large diminution of its numbers in consequence of the Fugitive Slave Law. One hundred and thirty of the communicants, as we are informed by the pastor, left the place from fear of arrest on the charge of being fugitive slaves, and have passed over to Canada.

The Methodist church in the same place has also lost a considerable number of its members from the same cause. There is said to be among these more disposition to make a stand, and to evade or resist the law, than among their Baptist brethren. Somebody had advised them to arm themselves and defend their liberty. The Baptist pastor, however, told his people that he found in the gospel examples which justified running away, but no examples which warranted fighting.

The Colored Baptist church at Rochester, which formerly numbered one hundred and fourteen communicants, has lost them all except two, since the passage of the Fugitive Slave Law. The pastor, a native Kentuckian, was the first to flee, and the whole flock followed him. The Colored Baptist church at Detroit has lost eighty-four of its members from the same cause. They abandon their homes and their occupations, sell such property as they cannot conveniently carry with them, and seek refuge in Canada.

Meantime, the number of persons escaping from their masters does not seem to be essentially lessened by the provisions of the Fugitive Slave Law. Since it was passed, we are informed from the same source which furnishes us with the particulars already given, eighty-seven fugitive slaves from the South have passed through Buffalo, on their way to Canada.

A large proportion of the colored persons, who have fled from the free States, have sought refuge in Canada, where they have been received with remarkable kindness, and have testified their grateful sense of this reception by their exemplary conduct. It is stated in the *Christiun Citizen*, that the sheriff of one of the Districts has given Mr. Henson, a worthy colored agent of the fugitives, a certificate that, during fifteen years, with a black population of from three to five thousand, not a single negro has come under legal custody or animadversion for any crime or misdemeanor whatever. Persons of high respectability, residing in other Districts, have borne testimony to the exemplary conduct of the fugitives, highly honorable to them, and encouraging to all the friends of emancipation.

The merchants in New-York who were active in getting up the Union meeting, besides sustaining newspapers that advocate Southern views, sent papers and handbills all over the South, denouncing their neighbors who declined signing the call for the "Castle Garden Meeting," or who had expressed sentiments hostile to the "peculiar institution," in order to deter Southern merchants from purchasing goods of them, and to increase their own business;—all, of course, under the plea of patriotism, and of supreme reverence for the sentiments contained in the Farewell Address of Washington.* Some of these merchants issued cards, announcing to their Southern customers that they were not opposed to their institutions,

* This Address in full was annexed to the published proceedings of the Castle Garden meeting, and sent abroad with a report of the inflammatory speeches of the attorneys on that occasion.

and did not fellowship Northern merchants and others who were. These nefarious measures, calculated to alarm persons engaged in trade, to induce them to suppress their real convictions and avow opinions not honestly held, were but too successful with the mass, both merchants and lawyers. Here and there a man was found who would not submit to such dictation, and scorned to earn his bread by sycophancy. Among them was a firm dealing largely in silk goods, a portion of whose customers resided in the slave States. Having been denounced by pliable and patriotic rivals, who had been pre-eminently active in originating the Union meeting, they issued the following card :*—

The public, including the New-York Journal of Commerce, are informed that we are silk merchants, and keep an extensive and well-assorted stock of goods, which we offer to responsible buyers on reasonable terms. As individuals, we entertain our own views on the various religious, moral and political questions of the day, which we are neither afraid nor ashamed to declare on all proper occasions. But we wish it distinctly understood that our goods, and not our principles, are in the market. The attempt to punish us as *merchants* for the exercise of our liberty as *citizens*, we leave to the judgment of the community.

BOWEN & McNAMEE.

New-York, Oct. 26, 1850.

Not to be outdone in patriotic zeal, several prominent clergymen in the city of New-York and elsewhere, instigated by influential politicians, delivered discourses virtually in favor of sustaining the Compromise, and in opposition to anti-slavery agitation, as a means of preserving the Union, which they affected to believe was in imminent peril.† The Union Safety Committee complimented the authors, requested for publication such of these discourses as were most in accordance with their views, and distributed large editions of them throughout the country, numbers being sent to Washington to be franked by members of Congress.‡

* Hon. Horace Mann, in his speech at Boston, April 10th, 1851, at the Grand Mass Convention against the Fugitive Slave Bill, said :—"I rejoice that this reference to the demoralizing power of interest gives me an opportunity to bestow well-deserved honor and praise upon a class of men who have withstood its temptations. Not every man engaged in manufactures or in commerce has yielded to the seductions of this tempter. There are many noble exceptions. I have in my mind one of my own constituents, largely interested in the fabric, who told me last summer that half his spindles were lying idle, and property that should have yielded income was incurring cost; 'but,' said he, 'do you see them *all* stop, and the mills decay and go down stream, before you vote for that compromise.' Another of my constituents told me he was largely interested in three ships, then at sea, but avowed he would see them all sink to its bottom before he would disgrace the country by passing the Fugitive Slave Bill. These are but specimens of that noble spirit which was expressed with such Spartan terseness by Bowen & McNamee of New-York, when the foul panderers to Southern slavery threatened them with a loss of custom. Said they, 'We sell silks, not principles.'"

† Had these clergymen looked to the stock-market instead of the demagogues they would have learned that neither in this country nor in Europe has there been the slightest apprehension of a dissolution of the Union in consequence of the slavery agitation. During the highest excitement in Congress, no material change took place in American stocks. A few timid holders sold out at about half of one per cent. less than the previous sales, but the stocks were soon higher than usual.

‡ A gentleman in Washington, who had written an article on the Divine Law, wrote to a correspondent in New-York, under date of April 11, 1851, as follows:

Some of these discourses were circulated, with warm encomiums, in newspapers that, until pro-slavery sermons began to appear, had censured ministers of the gospel for applying its principles to the political relations of men, for preaching political sermons. The sentiments of these divines sometimes exhibited a singular and amusing contrast to anti-slavery sentiments to which they had given utterance on previous occasions. Their new-born zeal for slavery received the marked commendation of active politicians and eminent statesmen, some of whom honored the preachers for the first time with attendance on their ministrations, and by commendatory notes of approbation.*

A few extracts will be made, as samples of some of the discourses above mentioned.

REV. ROBERT DAVIDSON, D.D., of New-Brunswick, N. J., says :—

It is certain that, without certain constitutional guarantees, the South would never have entered into the Union. By letting their peculiar institutions alone, therefore, we lose nothing; we are just where we would have been without a Union. These are purely local laws, local institutions. . . . Slavery is an evil, but disunion would entail a thousand evils. One is a partial and a local evil; the other would be a universal and a national disaster. . . . The Union brings us a thousand blessings; let us not for a single doubtful benefit hazard them all.

REV. ICHABOD S. SPENCER, D.D., of Brooklyn, N. Y., of the Old School Presbyterian Church, indulges his humor as follows :—

It is a most marvellous thing, what a number of clergymen, north of Mason and Dixon's line, have all of a sudden become such great *constitutional lawyers*! Never before was any thing like it! It is a modern miracle! A decision upon a great constitutional question is nothing to them! How amazingly these profound legalists, these clergymen jurists, would adorn the high courts of the country, if they would only consent to take their seat upon the bench! The Judges of the United States Supreme Court ought to be thankful that these clergymen judges have done their duty for them in advance, deciding the law to be unconstitutional, and no more is to be done! Benevolent men, these clergymen! Some have done the duty of the jurors for them, and others the duty of the judges; the verdict and the decision are both recorded! yea, indeed, in advance and without pay!

REV. NATHAN S. S. BEMAN, D.D., of Troy, N. Y., of the New School Presbyterian Church, says :—

Take it (the Compromise) all in all, I go for it. Let it not be disturbed, even by any modification, for the present. To be sure, it contains some bitter pills, and they are not sugar-coated either! It is a little humiliating that the United States—that is, *we*—have given Texas ten millions of dollars for a part of the lands which belonged to *ourselves* and not to *her*, and left in her hands *twenty-five thousand square miles* of our own territory as a bribe or bonus, in order to make the ten millions go down with a better relish. But let Texas have it all, money and lands, for she is *poor*; and this settles the encroachments of slavery in our Republic for ever. Call it a dowry to our feeble young sister, if you please."

"You may think some of my reflections upon pro-slavery clergymen too harsh. You would not, had you seen the cart-loads of their arguments in favor of the Fugitive Act and slavery generally, kept for distribution in this city, and now kept, which I have seen."

* These notes were furnished the pro-slavery editors for publication, and the receiver of one of them, addressed to him by the Secretary of State, could not repress his joy at its reception, but laid it before his people at his weekly lecture.

Rev. JOHN M. KREBS, D.D., of New-York city, says:—

Slavery was a domestic institution of the Israelites, actually recognized and allowed by the God of Israel. Did He, by the same law, both permit slavery and enjoin the emancipation of the fugitive? The idea is absurd, and the assertion makes Jehovah contradict himself. . . . Can we afford to have the refugee slave population of the South poured in upon us? Are they more moral, more religious, more happy here than they are alleged to be where they now are? And is the North prepared to welcome them *en masse*? In the single aspect of the measure, as a *sanitary cordon*, as a measure of police, the law and the compact of the Constitution may find its justification.

Rev. L. E. LATHROP, D.D., Auburn, N. Y., holds the following language:—

What is the duty of the citizen and the Christian? We answer, that both patriotism and Christianity require that the law should be obeyed. . . . If, by any act of legislation by this confederated government, we are required to restore to them that property to which they have a legal right, however much we may doubt the morality of that claim or the law upon which it is founded, the duty of good citizenship and the claims of true patriotism would demand obedience to the law. The responsibility in regard to the morality or the wisdom of the law rests not with us. That lies somewhere else. But with us is the responsibility of obeying the laws of the land, which have been established by the powers that be, and that are ordained of God.

Rev. JOHN C. LORD, D.D., of Buffalo, N. Y., speaks as follows:—

Never, since the eventful day on which our independence of the mother country was declared, has it been more obvious than during the struggles of the past year, that sound discretion and heavenly charity, those guardian angels of our liberties, though with fluttering wings, were hovering over our honored capital. Those there were who would have sundered the bonds that bound us together, even at the sacrifice of that charter of our hopes which they had sworn to maintain; and those there were, the true representatives of the nation, who remembered the struggles and the compromise of their fathers, and were true to their oaths, true to the Constitution, and true to the country. And, thank God, their counsels were predominant.

We make no war upon the domestic institutions of the South. Their institutions are not our concern. We do not disturb them; we never have disturbed them; we do not mean to disturb them. To the free colored man we open our doors and our churches; but we do not want fugitive slaves. They may be good men—there is *prima facie* evidence that they are bad. They are a trouble to us; they corrupt our population, overload our prisons, and one of the benefits of this law is, that they are so rapidly disappearing from the midst of us. . . . I have no hesitation in saying that it would be the greater sin at once to break up the system of slavery, and leave the slave to wander a vagabond in the earth, and thus become his tempter to crime. It would be unkind to the slave. Another is, that the harmony, the union, the unbroken integrity of these States is more to the slave, more to the master, more to the world than all the fugitive slaves the land contains. They ought not to cost so dear. . . . Do what we will for the slave; dispute for him till you sow discord among brethren; fight for him till the land is covered with gore and dismembered, and you never can put the negro race on a par with the descendants of Shem and Japhet.

Let us not talk of a higher law, which absolves men from obedience to a Constitution which they have sworn to maintain. . . . The forms of freedom are of little consequence to him who is made by color and caste a "hewer of wood and a drawer of water;" . . . but I am fully persuaded that colonization can alone secure those advantages, and give to the African that which alone makes personal freedom and free institutions valuable. . . . A more unprofitable and inconsequential abstraction (agitations on the subject of slavery) was never before made to disturb the peace and hazard the existence of a great empire.

Rev. GARDINER SPRING, D.D., New-York:—

If by one prayer I could liberate every slave in the world, I would not dare to offer it.

REV. MOSES STUART, late Professor in the Theological Institution at Andover, in his vindication of the Bill, reminds his readers, that many Southern slaveholders are *true* Christians; that sending back a fugitive to them is not like restoring one to an idolatrous people; that though we may pity the fugitive, yet the Mosaic law does not authorize the rejection of the claims of the slaveholders to their stolen or strayed *property*.

REV. ORVILLE DEWEY, D.D., of the Unitarian connection, asserts, that it is a duty to return fugitives, and he would send his own brother or child into slavery rather than that the Union between the free and slave States should be dissolved. "Your right," he says, "to be free is not absolute, unqualified, irrespective of all consequences. Personal rights ought to be sacrificed to the general good."

The Rev. W. M. ROGERS, an Orthodox minister of Boston, delivered on the last Thanksgiving day, a sermon in which he says: "When the slave asks me to stand between him and his master, what does he ask? He asks me to *murder a nation's life*; and I will not do it because I have a conscience—because there is a God." He proceeds to affirm that if this resistance to the carrying out of the Fugitive Slave Law should lead the magistracy to call the citizens to arms, their duty would be to obey; and, "if ordered to take human life, in the name of God to take it." And he concludes by admonishing the fugitives to "hearken to the Word of God, and to count their own masters worthy of all honor."

REV. WILLIAM CROWELL, of Waterville, State of Maine, has printed a Thanksgiving sermon of the same kind, in which he calls upon his hearers not to allow "excessive sympathies for a few hundred fugitives to blind them so as that they may risk increased suffering to the millions already in chains."

The Rev. Dr. TAYLOR, the Principal of the Theological Department of Yale College, at New-Haven, Connecticut, made a speech, at a late Union meeting, in which he deprecates the agitation upon the new law, and urges obedience to it, asking, "Is that article in the Constitution contrary to the law of nature, of nations, or to the will of God? Is it so? Is there a shadow of reason for saying it? I have not been able to discover it. Have I not shown you it is lawful to deliver up, in compliance with their laws, fugitive slaves, for the high, the great, the momentous interest of those [Southern] States?"

REV. Dr. PARKER, Philadelphia: "There are no evils in slavery but such as are inseparable from any other relation in civil and social life."

Rev. Bishop HOPKINS, Vermont: "Slavery is warranted by the Old Testament. What effect has the gospel in doing away with slavery? *None whatever.*"

It is refreshing to turn from these unworthy sentiments, to extracts from discourses and essays published about the same time by another class of preachers. Nothing has occurred during the anti-slavery agita-

tion in this country, more cheering to those engaged in it, than the independent and manly utterance of such noble sentiments.

Rev. R. S. STORRS, Jr., of Brooklyn, N. Y., Pastor of the (Congregational) Church of the Pilgrims:—

The man, thus dwelling by my side, is claimed by the person whom he formerly served. He is pursued by the officer. He is in peril of being taken. He comes to me for help and shelter, and for counsel in flight. The law of Congress says to me, "You shall not give it." The law of Congress says to me, "You shall grasp that neighbor, at the call of the officer, and deliver him to his pursuers." The question for me is, "Is that law a right one?" Not, "Was it passed with the proper formalities; or, Has it been certified by the proper officers?" Not even as a primary question, "Is it agreeable to the laws that preceded and that gird it; or, Is it likely to be enforced by the arm of the State?" The question is other and higher than these. It concerns me as immortal, and a subject of God. "Is this law right? Is it equitable and just? Does it agree with the law which God has given me, when he tells me to love my neighbor as myself? If I seize that man, and deliver him up; if I refuse to shelter and to help him, shall I do that which God approves? which I can meet with joy at the judgment, when human enactments shall have vanished and been forgotten?"

In answer to this question, there comes to me the law which God gave to Israel: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee: He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best: THOU SHALT NOT OPPRESS HIM." This specific requirement may have terminated upon the Hebrews; but if its principle were right, even in that darkened and barbarous age, how can it be otherwise under the blaze of Christianity? . . . Why shall I not HELP him, in his struggle for the rights that God gave him indelibly, when he made him a man? There is nothing to prevent, but the simple requirement of my equals in the State; the parchment of the law which they have written. But where will that parchment be when I meet this my brother in the judgment? Where will that parchment be when Christ shall say to me, with my eternity depending on his words, "I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat! I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink! I was naked, and ye clothed me not! I was a stranger, and ye took me not in! Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it not to ME."

NAY! NAY! my friends! I cannot do this essential injustice! Though the commands of the law were an hundred fold more stringent, I would not touch a hair of that man's head! Though its penalties were accumulated to tenfold greatness, they should not shut my doors against him! I will not resist the law by force and violence. I will even advise the man to flee it if he can, and not resist it, although it hurls him back upon his right of self-defense. But I will not obey it, unless by bearing its penalties. The man who does otherwise is in peril of his soul. For Eternity is grander than Time and its scenes! The Eye that shall search our life at the judgment, is more terrible than that of the human tribunal; and he that hath done wrong, shall meet it there! The omniscience of God will never forget it! I do not find that my fathers covenanted that I should do this act; but if they did, it must be cancelled. I cannot renew a covenant for such crime. . . . We must NEVER do wrong! It is right to obey magistrates, as the officers of society, so long as they rule justly. "Put them in mind," says the apostle, and I to-day repeat and urge it, "to be subject to principalities, to obey magistrates, and to be ready to every good work." But God has given us a law that is primary; that concerns us as immortal; that supersedes every other. When human law conflicts with this, it is duty to disobey that. We must say, with Peter, "We ought to obey God rather than men." And God's law is decisive, unequivocal, extending always to each of us—revealed to conscience as light is to the eye! "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart; and thou shalt love thy neighbor AS THYSELF." There is none other commandment—on earth or in heaven—that is greater than these.

Rev. NATHANIEL COLVER, of the Baptist denomination, Boston:—

Such is the inherent and manifest iniquity of this Bill, such its hostility to the law of God, as to render disobedience to its demands a solemn duty. . . . Obedience to this Bill will render us the efficient and direct responsible supporters of

slavery itself. . . . This Bill demands a palpable and flagrant violation of that universal and indispensable law of life, pressed upon us by the express command of our Lord: "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets." . . . Obedience to this Bill involves an outrage upon every law of hospitality to the stranger, and of charity to the needy, which the gospel enjoins; as well as upon every generous, manly, or religious prompting of the heart. . . . Obedience to this Bill involves a direct violation of many, very many of the moral precepts of the Bible. . . . This Bill should be abhorred and trampled under foot by every man, because it enjoins the commission of one of the blackest crimes specified in the divine catalogue."

REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER, of Brooklyn, N. Y., Minister of the Congregational "Plymouth Church :"—

The Fugitive Slave Law is a law which, upon occasion, makes it the duty of citizens to assist in putting a fellow-being into the rank of animals; nay, it makes it a duty to refuse the commonest humanities of life to a miserable wretch striving to escape such degradation, and to secure to himself those rights which every American has been taught that God gave to every man alike, and which crime only can alienate. A law to make citizens the inflictors of wrongs the most fatal, for which, once committed, no patience can bring a remedy, is such an insult to moral sense and common sense that the Christianity of a land which should tamely obey it would be a solemn mockery. What are we asked to do? To keep the compromise of the Constitution by violating the fundamental declaration of the Bill of Rights. To stand by when a wretch emerging from slavery begins to straighten up upon the level of manhood, to plunge him under the slimy wave again! We are asked to send men back to laws that deny their manhood. We, that are ministers of the gospel, are asked to teach our people the duty of obeying a law that sends a slave back, where it is a felony to teach him to read the Bible; to a condition which is almost universally without the gospel; we are to send back women to the lust of their masters; and to convert men, now of a long time industrious citizens, into chattels, to be advertised as cattle, driven in droves like cattle, sold and fed and worked like cattle, to die as a dog dieth, and to be covered down as a dog is buried! The phrase, to return a fugitive, is very harmless in its sound; but in its sense it comprises every offense that it is possible for one man to commit against another. This is the marrow of that Bill which churches are denounced as traitors for not supporting! When we have ceased to pray; when we have rooted out the humanities which since our connection with the gospel have been growing within us; when we have burned our Bibles and renounced our God, then we will join with those whose patriotism exhibits itself in disrobing men of every natural right, and driving them from light and religion into gross heathenism.

REV. SAMUEL T. SPEAR, of Brooklyn, N. Y., of the New School Presbyterian Church :—

I am not able to view the act in any other light than as a gross moral wrong against the victim. I put the matter directly to the conscience of the hearer. If it is not morally wrong before God to capture a man who has committed no crime, and forcibly drag him back to a bondage he loathes, and has a right to loathe, and which he has done his best to shun—if this be not morally wrong, then what is there in the distinction between right and wrong, that is of any moment? . . . My view of man is such that I could neither agree to do the thing, nor do it to fulfil the agreement of others. I would sooner die than be its agent. The higher law of Eternal Right would be in my way; and by its decision I must abide.

REV. DR. CHEEVER, of the city of New-York, Minister of the (Congregational) Church of the Puritans :—

Every evil must be looked in the face, and God's mercy must be sought in conquering it. No right principles must ever be sacrificed for the sake of union. . . . Every attempt at disunion is treason, and so are many of the pretended alarms of disunion. . . . Let every man seek for the things that truly make for peace, and things whereby one may edify another; but let him not think that peace cometh by concealing sin or justifying iniquity, or hardening ourselves in oppression or setting our will and our statutes in rebellion against God's Word.

Rev. CHARLES BEECHER, Minister of the Free Congregational Church of Newark, N. J.:—

Thus the legislation of 1850, to recapture fugitives, is immeasurably more shameful than that of 1793. I blush that our fathers should have framed, that Washington should have signed the latter, but I cannot believe they would have done it had they lived to our day. Much less can I believe they would have sanctioned a law whose provisions are so much more repugnant as are those of the law now under review. . . . Is *this* the law that is to consecrate in new holiness that statute born in sin, brought forth in shame, and grown up to manhood in unwashed corruption? . . . A law which does me injury is one thing. A law which makes me do wrong is another. The first I may submit to while seeking its repeal. To the latter I must not give place by subjection, no, not for an hour. The men that refuse obedience to such laws are the sure, the only defenders of law."

Rev. W. S. LEAVITT, Pastor of the Eliot Church, Newton, Mass.:—

All human law has its authority from God; and it can never be binding except so far as it can be obeyed consistently with our obedience to God. It may be our duty to submit to a law that unjustly requires us to *suffer* wrong; but we have no right to obey a law that requires us to *do* wrong. And when God's law and man's law come in conflict, we must give God's the preference, for we are sure in such a case that the law of man is wrong, and to obey it would be a sin. . . . But humanity is as much a part of religion as godliness; the second table of the law is as binding as the first; and an ordinance that forbids kindness to the oppressed, or makes humanity a curse, is at least as wicked as one that requires us to bow down to idols, or to refrain from prayer, and as little to be obeyed. Human enactments never can set aside the changeless claims of the law of God.

Rev. JOSEPH P. THOMPSON, Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, New-York:—

But how shall we act towards an unrighteous law—a law demanding what conscience and the Word of God forbid? We know how the Puritans acted under the oppressive measures of Laud and the tyrannical Stuarts, and we are accustomed to praise them, as does Hume, as the fathers of civil and religious liberty. We know how the martyrs and confessors of the Christian faith in all ages have acted under laws that did violence to their religious convictions. These have been orderly and peaceable citizens, supporting government, making no rebellion, but choosing to suffer the *penalty* of unrighteous laws, rather than to sin against God by obeying such laws. Nearly all that is noble and heroic in history, nearly all that has been accomplished for the emancipation and the progress of the race, stands connected with the decision, the self-denial and the suffering of these conscientious, these "obstinate" men. As to what is duty towards fugitives from slavery, let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind. The laws of the free States know no such thing as a slave; and for our part, living where personal liberty and life are made secure, we shall never acknowledge any man in the streets of our abode to be any thing but a man, having the same right to walk the streets and breathe the air, the same right to protection in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that God has given us. If to act on such a principle be an iniquity to be punished by the judge, then do we accept the penalty; saying with Paul before Festus, "for if I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die." The fugitive shall have bread; he shall have money; he shall have shelter; though at the cost of fines and imprisonment.

Rev. RUFUS W. CLARK, Pastor of the North Church, Portsmouth, N. H.:

While human government is of divine appointment, and is essential to the very existence of society, yet it has no power to *require its subjects to commit sin*. . . . There can be no dispute as to the general statement that government has no authority to *compel us to do wrong*. Our first and highest duty is that which we owe to God. . . . Any human law . . . that conflicts with either of these two great enactments, (the first and second commandments of God's law,) cannot be binding upon the consciences of men. To maintain the contrary of this, is to attempt to overthrow the government of Heaven. It is to place human constitutions above the constitution of God's moral universe. It is to value the Union of these States

above the union of the millions of worlds that comprise the kingdom of the Supreme Lawgiver and Judge.

Rev. W. H. FURNESS, Pastor of the First Congregational Unitarian Church, Philadelphia :—

My hearers, the existence of this law, abrogating as it does the law of humanity and of Christ, is a fountain of deadly poison in our midst, blinding our understandings, hardening our hearts, searing our consciences, falsifying all our religious professions, and perilling the salvation of our souls. Unless we ignore our manhood, renounce for ever our reason and our humanity, we must perceive now that we cannot remain neutral. We cannot be indifferent, without being indifferent to every thing that is manly, just and Christian: Here, in and through the fugitive slave, Christ speaks to us, and God. Eternal Justice, that Truth which is from everlasting to everlasting, which no one questions, whatever else may be disputed, addresses us, and commands us to do for our wronged brother as we would have him do for us, were we in his place. We are commanded to regard him as if it were Christ himself who claimed our sympathy and our aid. In the providence of Heaven, here is the grand test of our religious soundness, of our Christian integrity; if we evade this test, our religion is worthless, and though we may still say that we love God, and may still worship God, and profess to serve Him with a thousand offerings of praise and prayer and active charity, yet if we hate our brother, or, which is the same thing, neglect him as if we hated him, we are liars in the sight of God, and all our professions are in vain. We are yet in our sins, impenitent and unredeemed.

We have reason to believe that a large number of ministers of the gospel of different denominations have spoken out boldly in reference to the Fugitive Slave Bill, and that during the past year a larger number than at any previous time have preached an anti-slavery gospel. This is, we conceive, the most encouraging sign of the times. When, as a general thing, those who minister at God's altar proclaim the truth in its fulness with regard to this giant iniquity, the churches may be expected to be right on the subject.

The religious press, conducted principally by clergymen, has, with some exceptions, proclaimed its opposition to the unjust law with unusual clearness and fidelity; and some of these publications, edited with much talent, have with remarkable eloquence and power vindicated the claims of humanity. Many of their ablest articles have been transferred into the secular press, and thus religion (through that portion of its ministers) has been duly honored by large numbers who hitherto have had too much cause to believe that no inconsiderable number of the professed ambassadors of Christ were recreant to their Divine Master.

Being fully persuaded that the conduct of a large number of the ministers of the gospel in this country, from the commencement of the anti-slavery enterprise, has thrown obstacles in the way of its progress, and brought Christianity itself into disesteem, we rejoice to see talented and devoted ministers, especially the young, standing forth boldly as the champions of human rights, and refusing to be made the instrument of political men in defending iniquitous laws and party schemes.* We doubt

* It is said on good authority, that Daniel Webster went in person to Andover to request the signature of Professor Stuart to the letter from the merchants, manufacturers, and professional men of Boston and the vicinity, and the aid of his pen in sustaining him; that he took with him a Custom-house officer to call on the Pro-

not the number of such will be continually increasing, and that their seniors in the ministry who have been lukewarm on this subject, or opposed to the cause, will find their influence diminishing.

Of those who have borne witness against the Fugitive Slave Law, we have room to notice only the following, in addition to those already named:—

At a "Preachers' Meeting," consisting of the Methodist ministers of New-York, Brooklyn, and Williamsburg, November 9, 1850, more than thirty ministers being present, the subject of the Fugitive Slave Bill was very fully discussed, and the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

Whereas an act was passed at the last session of Congress entitled "an Act to amend, and supplementary to an act respecting fugitives from justice, and persons escaping from the service of their masters, approved Feb. 12, 1793;" and, whereas, said act virtually denies the right of habeas corpus, the privilege of trial by jury, and the right of appeal to an individual arrested under said act, on charge of being a fugitive from slavery, and also provides for the summary removal of such individual to the land of slavery upon "certificates" issued in a remote station, and "affidavits" that may be equally difficult of legal scrutiny, and which this bill declares "shall be conclusive of the right of the person" claiming such fugitive so to remove him, and cutting off "any process to prevent it, issued by any court, judge, magistrate, or other person whosoever."

And whereas, the fee of ten dollars on rendition of a decision in favor of the slave-catcher, while only five is allowed should the decision be in favor of the alleged fugitive, may serve as a bribe to corrupt magistrates to decide against the fugitive:

And whereas, by said bill, "all good citizens are commanded to aid and assist" in the execution of its provisions; and power is given to the slave-catchers appointed by the commissioners, "within their counties respectively," "to summon and call to their aid" any one who may chance to be near—thus compelling him, under the pains and penalties of law, to assist, and making our broad domain a hunting-ground for men, women and children, whose only legal offense is that, like our forefathers, they prefer freedom to slavery, and act from the principle that they have a right to be free:

And whereas, the "summary manner" in which the provisions of this bill are to be executed, is all calculated to defeat the ends of justice and good government, while the facilities it affords the kidnappers are such as to render insecure the dearest and most sacred rights of our colored citizens; therefore,

1. *Resolved*, That said bill is inconsistent with the Declaration of our National Independence, and with the Constitution of the United States, the one of which affirms that *all men* are endowed by God with the inalienable rights of "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness," and the other that "the writ of *habeas corpus* shall not be suspended unless when in case of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it," and also expressly guaranties that the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury.

2. *Resolved*, That said bill is inconsistent with the objects of our Federal Union, which, as set forth in the preamble to the Constitution, were, "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

3. *Resolved*, That said bill is iniquitous and unrighteous in its provisions, and in flagrant violation of the law of God,—it requires us to deliver up the fugitive, and commands all good citizens to assist, but God says, "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee;"—this bill requires us to place fetters upon the fugitive and send him back into bondage, while God

fessors and others for their signatures; and that Fletcher Webster went to Andover afterwards to assist Professor Stuart in correcting the proof-sheets of his pamphlet for the press! It should be recorded, to the honor of the young and talented Professors at that Seminary, that they refused to sign the letter.

says, "He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of the gates that liketh him best: thou shalt not oppress him."

4. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of all Christian men to seek, by all wise and prudent means, the immediate and unconditional repeal of said law; that this duty they owe to God, to their country, and to humanity.

(Signed)

D. W. CLARK,

W. K. STOPFORD,

E. E. GRISWOLD, *Chairman*.

M. D. C. CRAWFORD, *Secretary*.

The above resolutions, so honorable to the body adopting them, were denied insertion by the conductors of the organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as was alleged, from prudential reasons; yet it is believed that they are in accordance with the sentiments of a large number of the preachers in that denomination throughout the free States.*

Attempts have been made at meetings of laymen in the Methodist Church, chiefly in communities that trade with the South, to disparage the resolutions, and to show that they do not accord with the sentiments of the Methodist body at large. Were the Methodists in the Northern States wholly free from ecclesiastical connection with Methodists at the South, we are fully persuaded that the voice of a majority of them would be unequivocally expressed on behalf of human freedom.

An idea prevails somewhat that the Methodist Church North is entirely separated from the Methodist Church South, and that the separation was brought about by the opposition of the Northern party to slavery. In our last Annual Report, page 66, we showed that this was not the case. The statement has been denied, and it has been asserted that "no Annual Conference will elect a slaveholder to orders as a *travelling preacher*, although there may be some instances of electing such persons as local preachers." It was not said that there were *travelling preachers*, but *preachers*, who were slaveholders. There are many slaveholding ministers in that Church—ordained ministers. Itinerant preachers would find it very inconvenient to hold slaves, who must necessarily travel with them annually from one field of labor to another. We state, on the authority of the *True Wesleyan*, that so far as slavery is concerned, the Northern and Southern Church have the same discipline; that the M. E. Church always has cherished and still does cherish slaveholders in her bosom; that the M. E. Church has many slaveholding preachers, and ordains slaveholders to the work of the ministry; and that the Philadelphia Conference has ordained a slaveholder since the South separated, knowing him to be such. Much remains to be done in the M. E. Church North even, before it comes up to the standard of its illustrious founder, whose most matured sentiment, fearlessly announced, was, "SLAVERY IS THE SUM OF ALL VILLANIES."

* The Springfield, Mass., *Republican and Gazette* gives the following:—"The New England Methodist Convention, in session at Newburyport when Mr. Sumner was elected United States Senator, were treated to a special announcement of his election by a member of the body, when the whole Convention responded 'Amen!'"

The METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH SOUTH sustains no equivocal position on the subject of slavery. On a motion, at the last Annual Meeting, June, 1850, to strike out the section pronouncing slavery a "moral evil," and binding to efforts for its "extirpation," thirty-three voted for and forty-three against it; but a majority moved originally, it is said, by Rev. Jefferson Hamilton, a Massachusetts man, adopted a note that the section had long since ceased to be operative! They might have included with the note not a few texts of the Bible.

The PROTESTANT METHODIST body, which is a secession from the M. E. Church, and extends over North and South, at its Quadrennial Conference at Baltimore, within the last year, had an exciting debate on the subject of striking out the word "white" in its Constitution, for the purpose of extending the right of suffrage to the colored members of the Church, and rendering them eligible to office. It was finally decided that the Conference had no jurisdiction over the subject of slavery. The members of the Church residing at the North are very generally anti-slavery, but it seems that in this religious body they are as yet in the minority.

It is surprising that the members of this branch of the Methodist denomination do not perceive that slaveholding eats out piety in the Church. While acknowledging its leanness as to spiritual things, they do not appear to imagine that one of the chief causes is slavery. After forsaking the counsels of Wesley on this subject, it is not to be wondered at, that his followers at the South have lost their spiritual discernment. But it is somewhat remarkable that the delinquency should be pointed out by a portion of the body in a slave State. At the last annual meeting of the Methodist Protestant General Conference, a communication was presented from the Manchester Circuit, of Virginia, calling attention to the fact that the increase in four years was not three members to each minister within the Church, or not four to each one belonging to the travelling connection; and they impute this melancholy state of things to the failure of the Church to carry out Christ's teaching in reference to the slaves.

Many ecclesiastical bodies have taken action against the Fugitive slave Bill. The Associate Reformed Church protested against it, and against those who "decree unrighteous decrees, and write grievousness which they have prescribed, to turn away the needy from justice, and to take away the right of the poor," solemnly warning the members of the Church not to accept or hold any office in the discharge of which they may be called upon to enforce this bill, and urging them to endure its utmost penalties rather than bring upon themselves the guilt and upon their religion the reproach of countenancing its odious requirements by engaging in its execution.

The NEW-YORK EVANGELICAL CONGREGATIONAL ASSOCIATION resolved, "that we cannot recognize this law as of any binding force upon the citizens of our country," and gave very cogent reasons therefor.

The FREE-WILL BAPTIST CONFERENCE, consisting of about sixty ministers, from most of the free States in the Union, at the session in Providence, R. I., in October last, resolved that they could not obey the cruel and wicked law recently enacted by Congress, or sympathize with its framers or abettors; and that, considering the passage of the Bill an attempt to set human enactments above the Divine Law, it seemed to them incumbent upon every Christian to disregard such a law, as an infringement upon his duty to God and humanity.

Before their adjournment, they adopted the following petition to Congress:—

To the Hon. the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

The undersigned, officers of the General Conference of Free-Will Baptists of the United States, in obedience to the unanimous instructions of said Conference, given in Triennial Convention, composed of delegates representing fifty thousand communicants, assembled at Providence, R. I., October, 1850, respectfully petition your honorable bodies to repeal the "*Fugitive Slave Law*," passed at the last session of Congress; and as in duty bound will ever pray.

MARTIN CHENEY, *Moderator.*

THOMAS PERKINS, }

JACOB W. DARLING, } *Assistant Moderators.*

SILAS CURTIS, *Secretary.*

EBENEZER KNOWLTON, }

GEORGE H. BALL, } *Assistant Secretaries.*

At the annual meeting of the AMERICAN MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION held at Rochester, N. Y., September last, the following resolutions were adopted:—

Resolved, That this Association, in the prosecution of its work, aims to promulgate the principles of Him who "came to preach deliverance to the captives," to "open the prison-doors to them that are bound," to relieve the oppressed, to enlighten the ignorant, to abolish caste, and to elevate men to the enjoyment of equal rights; and that it feels bound to adopt and inculcate every righteous principle which may, in the providence of God, be brought before the consideration of His people.

Resolved, That we believe the Christianity of the nation is about to be tested in view of the late act of Congress for the recovery of Fugitive Slaves, which appears equally at variance with the principles of this Association, the Constitution of the country, and the law of God; and that as Christians, we do solemnly covenant with each other and our colored brethren that we cannot obey it, nor any law that evidently contravenes the higher law of our Maker, whatever persecution or penalty we may be called to suffer.

The Synod of the FREE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES, at their meeting in April, 1851, issued a Declaration and Testimony against the Fugitive Slave Law. It is a powerful document. The Synod recommends that it be read from the pulpit on the Lord's day, so that all their people may hear it, and be called upon solemnly to express their adherence thereto in such a manner as may be deemed proper. The Synod testifies and declares unceasing hostility to the system of American slavery, and also disapprobation of the two branches of the Presbyterian Church in the United States from which they seceded, "and which still continue to authorize and justify the sin of slavehold-

ing, as it is practised by multitudes of their ministers, elders, and church members."

The Society of FRIENDS, at Quarterly Meeting at New-Brighton, Pa., adopted a memorial to Congress against the Fugitive Bill. We lament that this ancient and respectable association do not more generally and extensively emulate the example of their brethren in Great Britain, in taking prominent and efficient action on the subject of slavery. Their neglect to do so not only repels people of color from their community, but lessens the confidence of the colored race in the friendliness of that Society. We could wish also that the Friends were more thorough in manifesting their anti-slavery sentiments and memorializing legislative bodies, at their yearly meetings. At the last yearly meeting of that portion of the Society sympathizing with the late Elias Hicks, the appointment of a Committee on Slavery was refused, and the subject referred to the Representative Committee. The same body a few months previously memorialized Congress against the *African* slave-trade, without alluding to the *American* slave-trade at Washington and elsewhere in the country.*

The Governors of several of the free States have, in their communications to their respective legislative bodies, intimated their disapprobation of the Fugitive Slave Bill, and the Legislatures have evinced their accordance with such sentiments.

Vermont, as she has often done when human liberty has been invaded, took the lead. At the late session of the Legislature the following act was passed:—

AN ACT relating to the writ of *habeas corpus* to persons claimed as fugitive slaves, and the right of trial by jury.

It is hereby enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont—

SEC. 1. The same power is hereby given to, and the same duties imposed upon, the circuit Judges of the several judicial circuits of this State, which are given to and imposed upon the Judges of the Supreme Court by the provisions of chapter thirty-eight of the Revised Statutes, entitled of "*Habeas Corpus*."

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of State's attorneys, within their respective counties, whenever any inhabitant of this State is arrested or claimed as a fugitive slave, on being informed thereof, diligently and faithfully to use all lawful means to protect, defend, and procure to be discharged every such person so arrested or claimed as a fugitive slave.

SEC. 3. The application of any State's attorney in writing to any one of the Judges of the Supreme Court, or to any circuit Judge, signed by said State's attorney in his official capacity, stating in substance the name of the prisoner and the persons

* It is a well-known fact that since the days of Paul Cuffee, the number of colored members of the Society of Friends has been steadily diminishing. "It is," says the *Non-Slaveholder*, "a common practice to allow if not direct colored people to occupy the back seat in Friends' meeting-house, and thus their attendance is prevented." We noticed that in the same paper it was recently stated that the only colored member of the Society in North Carolina had lately deceased! It would be surprising, were it not well known that the natural tendency of all reformatory associations of Christians as they increase in numbers and wealth is to relinquish their distinguishing practices, that any of the followers of Fox and Penn should exhibit equivocal conduct on the subjects of slavery and caste.

detaining him, if known, and that the person arrested, claimed, or imprisoned, is arrested, claimed, or imprisoned as a fugitive slave, shall be sufficient authority to authorize the issuing of the writ of *habeas corpus*, as provided in said chapter thirty-eight of the Revised Statutes; and said writ may be signed by any one of said Judges, or the clerk of the Supreme or County Court; and said writ shall be made returnable to the Supreme or county court, when in session, in the county where such application is made; and in vacation said writ may be made returnable forthwith before either of the judges aforesaid.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of all judicial and executive officers in this State, in their respective counties, who shall know or have good reason to believe that any inhabitant of this State is about to be arrested or claimed as a fugitive slave, forthwith to give notice thereof to the State's attorney of the county in which such person resides.

SEC. 5. Whenever the writ of *habeas corpus* is granted in vacation, as provided in this act, or as provided by existing laws, if, upon the hearing of the same before any one of the Judges aforesaid, the person imprisoned, arrested, or claimed as a fugitive slave shall not be discharged, such person shall be entitled to an appeal to the next stated term of the County Court in the county where such hearing was had, on furnishing such bail, and within such time, as the Judge granting the writ, on hearing the case, shall adjudge to be reasonable and proper.

SEC. 6. The court to which such appeal is taken, and any other court to which a writ of *habeas corpus* in behalf of any such person claimed or arrested as a fugitive slave is made returnable, may and shall, on application of either party to such proceeding, allow and direct a trial by jury on all questions of fact in issue between the parties, in the matter aforesaid; and the taxable costs of such a trial shall be chargeable to the State, whenever the same would be otherwise chargeable to the person arrested or claimed as a fugitive slave.

SEC. 7. The several circuit Judges shall have the same powers now vested in the Judges of the Supreme Court, by virtue of an act in amendment of chapter one hundred and three of the Revised Statutes, relating to persons confined in close jail on executions of tort, approved November 13, A. D. 1848.

SEC. 8. This act shall take effect from its passage.

APPROVED, Nov. 13, 1850.

The pro-slavery press, as might have been expected, opened their batteries upon the "mad State," accusing it of a desire to scatter the Constitution to the winds, and with it the glorious Union! But an examination of the law will show that the patriotic Vermonters have kept strictly within the line of constitutional obligation, while they have secured to all within their boundaries the great bulwarks of liberty—the Habeas Corpus and the Jury Trial.

A powerful effort has been made to induce Pennsylvania to repeal the act of 1847, which forbade State officers aiding in the reclamation of fugitives, and its enemies succeeded so far as to procure the repeal of that portion of it that forbids the use of the jails for recaptured slaves. But the Governor has not as yet signed the bill, and it is reported that he does not intend to do so.

The Ohio Legislature, in March, 1851, passed resolutions in opposition to the Fugitive Slave Law, and in favor of its immediate repeal, as follows:—

IN SENATE, March 22, 1851.

Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That while this General Assembly would urge the faithful observance of law upon all the people of this State, and of her sister States of the Union, as the most effectual mode of promoting their best interests, as well as a high duty they owe alike to themselves and their common country, it would most earnestly recommend to Congress the necessity of so amending and modifying the provisions of the Fugitive Slave Law, that

while it secures a faithful compliance with all the obligations imposed by the Constitution of the United States, it will, as it becomes a free government, guard with a jealous care the rights of the freeman. And if said law, in the opinion of Congress, cannot be so amended as to give to persons claimed as fugitives from labor the benefit of every legal defense of their liberty, we then recommend the repeal of said law.

Ayes 19, nays 10. Three of the nays were by Free-Soilers, who thought the resolution too tame and weak.

Resolved, That the law, commonly called the Fugitive Slave Law, being a law that makes *ex-parte* evidence conclusive of the master's right to recapture and return his slave; that denies him a jury trial *here or elsewhere*; that provides for the appointment of swarms of petty officers to execute it; that gives a double compensation to find every claim set up in favor of the master, and pays the expenses, in any case, from the public treasury; ought never to receive the voluntary co-operation of our people, and ought therefore to be immediately repealed.

Ayes 21, nays 8.

These resolutions were transmitted to the House, and there concurred in by the following emphatic vote: First resolve, ayes 50, nays 10. Second resolve, ayes 41, nays 21.

Numerous meetings have been held to protest against the Fugitive Slave Bill, and so far as we have been able to ascertain, the general sentiment of the people throughout the Free States is decidedly opposed to it.* We have not room for the patriotic resolutions adopted at these meetings.

Restraint has been put upon a free expression of public sentiment by politicians interested in maintaining their influence with political men at the South, and by divines unwilling to weaken the cords that unite Southern and Northern churches in the same ecclesiastical bodies. Would Northern men cut themselves loose from such affinities, and act out their own convictions, how soon would not alone the Fugitive Slave Bill, but the system of slavery itself, whose perpetuation demands such enactments, cease to disturb the peace and blight the prospects of the nation. How long shall men from whom we have a right to expect better things, in their literary, theological and political relations, submit their own necks to the yoke of the Slave Power?

During the past year the press of the United States, both secular and religious, has teemed with articles on the slavery question to a greater extent than ever before. The Fugitive Slave Bill has been amply discussed, and the public have eagerly perused what has been published on

* As indications of an increasingly kind feeling towards people of color, we record with pleasure that the Senior Class of the Meadville (Pa.) Theological School the last year invited Rev. S. R. Ward, a distinguished colored preacher, to deliver their anniversary discourse. The conductors on railroads, in many instances, befriend colored people, not even neglecting fugitives. We give an instance. On the Worcester and Nashua Railroad, (Mass.), the train passed the four-mile station without stopping until about fifty rods beyond. "Is there no one at the station?" inquired the conductor. "Nobody, sir, but a nigger," was the reply. "Back up your train," said the conductor, "and let him get on then."

the subject. Efforts have been made by official and paid attorneys to demonstrate its constitutionality. Their principle is that this law is as constitutional as that of 1793, to which it is supplementary; and that it is even less stringent in its provisions. And yet one reason alleged for the necessity of the new law, was the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States that one of the chief sections of the law of 1793 was unconstitutional, viz.: that requiring State officers to execute a law of Congress. In addition to this, many eminent jurists have, from time to time, decided that said law is not constitutional, because "the Constitution," in the language of Judge Story, "executes itself;" and in the language of Chancellor Walworth, because it did not give a right of trial by jury; and inasmuch as the Constitution, in the language of Judge Tappan, uttered many years since, "does not give ANY power to Congress to legislate on the subject of fugitive slaves." And it is remarkable that no longer ago than March 7, 1850, the Hon. Daniel Webster himself declared, in a speech in the Senate, "I have always thought that the Constitution addressed itself to the Legislatures of the States themselves, or to the States themselves. . . . It seems to me the import of the passage (Art. iv. Sec. 3) is, that the State itself, in obedience to the Constitution, shall cause him (the person held to service or labor) to be delivered up. That is my judgment. I have always entertained it, and I entertain it now." How absurd then to argue that the law of 1850 is constitutional, because it is in accordance with the law of 1793; and how preposterous to assert that every man is bound to obey a law until it shall have been decided to be in all respects unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is somewhat remarkable that Judges of the United States Court have, in their charges to grand juries, in various districts, entered into elaborate arguments to show the constitutionality of the law of 1850; have spoken of the necessity of it to preserve the Union, and accompanied their arguments and remarks by such allusions to popular feeling that in more than one instance the spectators have applauded on the spot. It has appeared—in fact accusations to this effect have been made—that the Judges had agreed to anticipate the judgment they might be required to make, by opinions given without argument of counsel. A most extraordinary procedure, truly! Nor is this all; they have endeavored to sustain the act of Congress by showing that as a political measure it tends to hush discontent and preserve the Union of the States.

With regard to the unconstitutionality of the law, we present in the first place,* side by side, those sections of the Bill and Constitution which must strike every honest and intelligent man as capable of no reconciliation whatever:—

* Taken from the *Independent Democrat*, Concord, N. H.

U. S. CONSTITUTION.

NO PERSON SHALL BE DEPRIVED OF LIFE, LIBERTY, OR PROPERTY, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS OF LAW.

In suits at Common Law, where the value in controversy shall *exceed twenty dollars*, the RIGHT OF TRIAL BY JURY SHALL BE PRESERVED; and no fact tried by a jury shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the Common Law.

The right of the people to be SECURE IN THEIR PERSONS, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, &c.

The privilege of the writ of Habeas Corpus SHALL NOT BE SUSPENDED unless when, in case of REBELLION or INVASION, the public safety may require it.

Here are the provisions of the two laws. And to our mind, a more direct antagonism could hardly be framed. The Constitution says, no person shall be deprived of his liberty without *due process of law*. The Slave Act says, *all cases involving personal liberty shall be decided in a summary manner*; that is, as the terms are well understood, "*without due process of law*."

The Constitution says, in suits where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of TRIAL BY JURY SHALL BE PRESERVED. The Slave Act says, in all controversies respecting the right of a MAN to himself, the right of a trial by jury SHALL BE DENIED.

The Constitution says, "the writ of Habeas Corpus SHALL NOT BE SUSPENDED unless in cases of REBELLION or INVASION." The Slave Act says it shall ALWAYS BE SUSPENDED in relation to every man *claimed* as a fugitive from slavery.

Nor are these all the points wherein this slave law conflicts with the "higher law" of the Constitution. That instrument declares that "all powers not *expressly* delegated to the General Government are reserved to the several States." Yet no man can find in the Constitution the slightest express authority for *any* legislation by Congress on the subject of returning fugitives from slavery.

Viewed, therefore, in whatever light it may be, the Act is as palpably violative of the Constitution as it is of every principle of civil and republican liberty. It is a sheer usurpation of powers never conferred on Congress or the General Government, and which can only be submitted to by a people who are willing to be slaves. As such, every citizen who desires to preserve the Constitution in its purity, and in the spirit of its founders, is bound by every rightful means in his power to resist the unwarranted enactment, and refuse all obedience to its inhuman mandates.

In addition to the above, and with reference to section 4th of the new Act, we would inquire whence the District Courts under the Constitution derive their authority of delegating to Commissioners the power of trying a cause, and what constitutional provision there is justifying Congress in authorizing them to do so?

The provision in section 10th, which enables a person to go before a court of record, and claim a man as his slave who resides in another State, establishing such claim on *ex-parte* evidence, is a most daring violation of the first principles of justice.*

Notwithstanding all that has been said in favor of the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Bill, lawyers and jurists not a few, competent to decide upon such a question, have pronounced it unconstitutional in its spirit and letter; and all the special pleading of its advocates has not been

THE FUGITIVE BILL.

Such Court, Judge or Commissioner whose duty it shall be to hear and determine the case of such claimant IN A SUMMARY MANNER.

In no trial or hearing under this act shall the testimony of such alleged fugitive be admitted in evidence; and the certificate in this and the first section mentioned shall be conclusive of the right of the person or persons in whose favor granted, to remove such fugitive to the State or Territory from which he escaped, and shall prevent all molestation of said person or persons BY ANY PROCESS ISSUED BY ANY COURT, JUDGE, OR MAGISTRATE, OR OTHER PERSON WHOMSOEVER.

able to convince the great body of the people in the free States to the contrary. The people of this country have been too well instructed in the principles of the Common Law and civil liberty not to understand so simple a question as this. They know well the difference between a technical and a practical use of the writ of *Habeas Corpus*, and the other great securities provided in our system of government for the protection of its citizens of whatever condition in society; and the law in question, like all other enactments in this country by the national Legislature, must be adjudicated by the great Court of Errors—THE PEOPLE.*

In addition to the unconstitutionality of the Bill, many of its provisions are manifestly cruel, inhuman and infamous. In the first place, a bribe is held out to Commissioners in allowing double fees in case of conviction. The 5th section has the following requisition: "ALL GOOD CITIZENS ARE HEREBY COMMANDED to aid and assist in the prompt and efficient execution of this law, whenever their services may be required." Any person who shall assist a fugitive directly or indirectly to escape, or harbor or conceal so as to prevent discovery, after notice or knowledge that he is a fugitive, shall be liable to a fine of \$1,000 and six months' imprisonment, and to a suit of damages for \$1,000 for each fugitive lost to his owner by said obstruction or rescue.

The summary manner in which the Bill is to be executed, its barbarity, exemplified in the case of Hamlet and others, in seizing men when engaged in their daily employments and hurrying them off, on *ex-parte* testimony, unknown to their families or friends, giving no opportunity to summon witnesses or employ counsel, would stamp the Bill as infamous† in any community under heaven; and when such acts are sought to be perpetrated in this age of the world, in a country so boastful of its liberty, and of its sympathy with the oppressed of other nations, their shamelessness and turpitude are beyond the power of language to express. It is no marvel that indignation meetings have been provoked, that threats of armed resistance have been uttered, that the humane and enlightened of other nations have been astounded, and that the cause of civil liberty has

* It is said that the Supreme Court of Massachusetts have decided the Bill to be constitutional. Their argument was based upon technicalities and upon precedents, as has been well observed. It is also said that Daniel Webster has pronounced the Bill constitutional. The Bill of 1793 made it the duty of State officers to deliver up fugitives. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the Prigg case, decided that they were *not* bound to deliver them up. Mr. Webster, in his speech of March 7, said that the Constitution committed this business to the *States, not to Congress*; but he has since acquiesced in the decision of the Supreme Court, that Congress can legislate respecting slaves, as a *lawyer* is bound to do, although in his place as *Senator* he uttered a different opinion. The Supreme Court of the United States have virtually pronounced one portion of the act of 1793 unconstitutional, upon which the act of 1850 is based, and have not yet passed upon the act of 1850. Meantime eminent jurists and statesmen differ in opinion as to the constitutionality of the act of 1850. Let the people decide.

† It was said by Hon. Thaddeus Stevens on the floor of Congress, "The law of 1793 for the recovery of fugitive slaves is *INFAMOUS*." How much stronger should be the condemnation of the more stringent act of 1850.

received through this country a fearful wound. The authors of the Bill inveigh against the despots of Europe, and the agents of their cruelty and oppression, for trampling under foot the rights of man. But what apology can be framed for them, the descendants of Hampden and Sidney, Bradford, Winthrop, Hawley, Otis, Henry, &c., for thus outraging free institutions?

We are told from the forum and the pulpit that the laws of the land must be obeyed at all hazards; that the people, whose representatives have framed them on their behalf, are passively to submit to them until they shall have been repealed by the Legislature, or pronounced unconstitutional by the highest Courts; that "resistance to them is rebellion against God;" while the "higher law" is sneered at by statesmen, churchmen, and jurists. Judge Sprague, of the United States Court for the Massachusetts District, in his charge to the Grand Jury, has recently uttered the following astonishing language:—

Unjust and oppressive laws may indeed be passed by human governments; but if infinite and inscrutable wisdom permits political society having the power of human legislation to establish such laws, (as are in the view of any persons inconsistent with the justice and benevolence and against the will of the Supreme Lawgiver,) may not the same infinite and inscrutable wisdom permit and require the individual who has no such power to obey them?

It has been well said that a principle is here laid down by a Judge upon the bench which strikes at the very existence and authority of morality and justice. But such abominable ethics are not, we should be thankful, avowed by all our judges and statesmen. Mr. Justice McLean, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in a recent letter, says:—

An unconstitutional act of Congress imposes no obligation on a State or the people of a State, and may be resisted by an individual or a community. No one, I believe, will controvert this.

Hon. John M. Niles, ex-Senator from Connecticut, in a recent letter says:—

This [Fugitive] law is not only a palpable and dangerous violation of the Constitution, but is equally subversive of all the great principles of liberty, which a free people should cherish. The duty of the people in respect to an unconstitutional and oppressive law must always be in some measure a question of expediency, depending on the circumstances of the case. *When danger is imminent, and redress cannot be hoped for in any other way, resistance by force is not only justifiable, but a duty.*

The judgment of enlightened and impartial men of all professions in foreign countries, respecting the Fugitive Slave Bill, has been expressed without reserve. Their sentiments coincide with the opinion expressed by the Right Honorable S. Lushington, LL.D., Judge of the Admiralty Court of England, and one of the most distinguished civilians of that country, who, on reading the Bill, wrote as follows:—

No one can feel more sincerely than myself abhorrence at the Fugitive Slave Bill; a measure as cruel and as unchristian as ever disgraced any country.

There is no little confusion, in the minds of those who have declaimed

against disobedience to the Fugitive Slave Law, between *disobedience* and forcible *opposition* to a law of the land. Disobedience is one thing and resistance quite another, *i. e.*, forcible or armed resistance. The anti-slavery men of the United States, as a body, are men of peace, and they have neither counselled nor practised any violent resistance to unjust and unconstitutional enactments. They claim the right of disobeying them and taking the penalty. In Boston, recently, the peaceable and legal resistance to the Bill was most unjustly characterized by some as unconstitutional and treasonable violence, notwithstanding the disclaimers put forth by the patriots who were simply endeavoring to oppose legally what they justly deemed an unconstitutional and infamous enactment of Congress, as will appear from the following brief paragraph from the *Commonwealth* :—

We take this occasion to repeat, what we have frequently said, that we countenance no resistance to law. We need not reiterate our abhorrence of the Fugitive Slave Law. But we rely solely upon legal, constitutional modes of opposition. No other modes have been attempted in Boston, and we do not believe that any other modes are thought of. The liberties of free citizens must be protected by employing all the safeguards which our laws afford.

It is no new thing, either in this country or in England, for men to disobey laws they cannot conscientiously obey. The time is approaching, we trust, when neither law-makers nor preachers will contend that they have no right so to do. Meantime it should be well understood that unconstitutional laws, or those deemed such, or laws contrary to the Divine or Higher Law, may be disobeyed by individuals on their own responsibility, and in some cases even resisted. We have examples of this in history, and even in the annals of our own country. President Jefferson treated the Alien and Sedition Laws as unconstitutional. President Jackson denounced the United States Bank, although the Supreme Court of the United States had decided that the act creating it was constitutional. He said, "I take the responsibility."* John Hampden resisted the authority of government, and gained in history the fame of an illustrious patriot. Who will now rise up and condemn those men for thus anticipating the maturer opinions of their own age and the judgment of posterity?

Having clearly shown that the law in question is unconstitutional, and that whether it is so or not, a citizen may, on his own responsibility, refuse obedience to its mandates, it is manifest that it is also, as before charged, both cruel and inhuman.

Kidnapping to an alarming extent can be carried on under this Bill, as can be clearly seen by an examination of its provisions, and a knowl-

* General Jackson was much censured, but he afterwards told a Senator of the United States, that he knew at the time that the Bank was insolvent, but the information was derived from a Director, in confidence; and that he was in duty bound to remove the large funds of Government then on deposit in the Bank, and denounce the institution.

edge of facts daily transpiring. Wherever an ignorant or corrupt Commissioner can be found, forged papers, or papers illegally or fraudulently obtained in slave States, in connection with false witnesses, will be sufficient for the arrest and removal of any person of color, or person bearing any resemblance to the colored race. In fact no white person is, under the law, safe; and it may be that nothing but his position in society, and his fraternization with the South, saves even the Great Exponent of the American Constitution from the Southern prison-house. Even his superior knowledge of common and statute law would be of no avail, before such Commissioners as are now intrusted with power to adjudicate cases involving the liberty of man. The trial is "summary"—the decision "conclusive." The sword of Damocles is suspended over the head of every officer, and the purses of Union Safety Committees furnish the ready means to fee eminent attorneys, bestow services of plate, and reward in various other ways the satraps of the city, State and national Governments.

Not only is kidnapping under the forms of laws carried on, but more secret villanies of this description are practised under cover of this Bill. When so many persons are sent into the free States, or are employed within them to hunt up, inform against, or seize fugitive slaves for reward, a strong temptation is furnished to kidnappers to molest and enslave persons who have been slaves but who are now legally free, and people of color who have always been free. There is proof that this has been done in many instances. The law, instead of being the friend of the defenseless, has become their enemy, and practices pronounced piratical and worthy of death when committed on the African shore are shielded when perpetrated in the free States of this country.*

Children have been carried off from their play-grounds, while on errands, or in the darkness of night; women have been persuaded to go South as servants; sailors have been shipped at Northern ports, taken to the South and sold, when they had been shipped, as they supposed, for foreign voyages. All this has been done in free States. The relations and friends of the unhappy victims have been unable to reclaim them. These things have been done to a greater extent than is usually supposed. In too many instances the nefarious acts thus alluded to have been perpetrated, not by Southern men, but by Northern miscreants. It is not the least of the objections to the Fugitive Slave Bill, that it affords facilities to the marauding and successful enterprises of slave-hunters. It has rekindled the bad passions of slaveholders in all their connections,

* A lawyer, who has filled a high position in the Government of the United States, and who is again in a waiting posture for office, lately said he was constrained to believe the act of 1850 to be constitutional, and added, "but it is the most cruel and inhuman law on the statute-book." He was asked if the Constitution of the United States allowed cruel and inhuman laws, and if so, what should be thought of that instrument?

and stimulated the cupidity of numerous wretches who can be hired to be their instruments. The following facts are adduced in proof of these assertions:—

A negro, says the *True Democrat*, claiming to be free, was openly seized at Cincinnati, by a party from Kentucky, and hurried on board a ferry-boat, at mid-day.

The *Standard* and *New-York Evangelist* mention, an attempt was made to kidnap a free colored young woman, who was a native of Massachusetts, in New-York, and put her on board a schooner below the Atlantic Dock, Brooklyn, and she would have been carried South had not some bystanders rescued her.

A colored boy, born at Harrisburg, Pa., we learn from the *Tribune* of March 7th, was kidnapped in Pennsylvania in February, by some slave-hunters, and has not been heard of since.

The Philadelphia *Ledger* reports the case of a black man named Thomas Hall, an honest, sober and industrious man, who was stolen at West Cala township, Pa., by three men, who burglariously entered his house, felled him with a bludgeon, and dealt severe blows at his wife. He has not been heard from.

In the Criminal Court, in Philadelphia, in March, George F. Alberti and J. Frisby Price were put on trial for kidnapping Catharine Thompson and child, colored persons. The testimony against the accused was strong. The jury returned a verdict of guilty, and both prisoners were sent to Moyamensing prison.

Kidnapping is not confined to the free States. The Baltimore correspondent of the *Tribune* states, February 3d, that "quite a system of kidnapping has been carried on between Kent and Queen Ann's counties, Md., and Baltimore city, for some months past;" and adds the following:—

The gang were finally ferreted out, and two ringleaders, named Moffitt and Price, and several auxiliaries, have been arrested, held to bail, or committed to answer for their outrages. Their plan of operations has been to catch an unwary negro boy or girl in the country, take him or her to a private house, and keep them till an opportunity was afforded to bring them to Baltimore. Here no difficulty was experienced in selling them to the numerous slave-dealers with whom our city is cursed, and, no representations of the poor negro being heeded, their fate is sealed.

A few days since a Mr. Spear, of Kent county, had a servant girl spirited away, and as he did not believe she had absconded, he suspected this kidnapping gang. Accordingly he came to the city, and, by the aid of an officer, in the course of a day, found his girl at the slave depot of the Messrs. Campbell, West Pratt street. Messrs. Campbell showed a legal bill of sale made out in the names of Moffitt and Price, in which it was evidenced that they had paid \$425 for the girl. Of course her master demanded and obtained her.

The charge made by foreigners and some of our own citizens, that we are a slaveholding nation, has been stoutly denied, notwithstanding the notorious fact that in various ways slavery and the domestic slave-trade have been patronized and extended by the National Government. The Fugitive Slave Bill has made us a slaveholding nation, so far as it could

be done by those who enacted it or have sustained it. The authorities of the United States—legislative, judicial and executive—have not only combined to sustain slavery and to recover fugitives, but to make, under heavy penalties, every citizen of the country a participant. What more is necessary to constitute this a slaveholding nation? The fact is, we have for many years been verging in that direction, in defiance alike of the foundation principles of the government, and of the precepts and examples of its illustrious founders. We need only allude to the Constitution, in which the words *slave* and *slavery* are studiously avoided; to the Ordinance of 1787, which placed limits to the extension of slavery; and to the action of Jay, Franklin, and their associates, in forming societies for the abolition of slavery; in contrast with the numerous acts of the General Government at subsequent periods, several of which we shall hereafter enumerate, for the encouragement and perpetuation of slavery and the domestic slave-trade.

The slaveholders of this country have, within a few years past, made desperate efforts to strengthen and extend the "peculiar institution" on this continent, and have repeatedly, with the concurrence of Northern men, been too successful. This has emboldened many of them openly to avow their determination to sustain slavery at all hazards, and to persist in wielding the powers of the General Government in aid of their design. This class pretend that the theory of Jefferson and Madison, with reference to the equality of man, is an exploded doctrine,* and that the institution of slavery is to be perpetual in this country.†

The attempt to bring the Northern States into an acquiescence in the infamous Fugitive Slave Bill, and thus to familiarize them with the atrocities of slavery, will meet, we trust, a great discomfiture. Thus the odious Bill, and the system from which it sprung, will sink to a lower depth of hate. No measure has ever been devised, so well adapted as this to open the eyes of Northern citizens to their rights and the true character of slavery. The Bill has induced the free citizens of the North to revert to the original principles upon which the government was founded, and to refresh their memories as to their rights and privileges under the Common Law and the reciprocal obligations of the States. Agitators not only, but calm and reflecting men, are discussing these things in the light of the Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. It cannot be that this discussion will result in any thing less than a determination to bring the administration of the country back to original

* Mr. Barnwell's speech in the Senate of the United States, *Evening Post*, July 13, 1850.

† Mr. Woodfin, in the Senate of North-Carolina, said, in January, 1851: "Sir, I have no uneasiness about the fate of slavery in the South. Whatever change it may occasion in governments, or however much we may differ about forms of government, about State policy and national associations, that institution is as unalterably identified with the South as the climate and the leading Southern staples."

principles, and to wrest the government from the usurped control of those who would fasten upon the nation the stigma of being the last in Christendom to sustain chattel slavery.

We see nothing in the fact that associations are formed in cities and other places trading extensively with the South, or that pro-slavery pulpits render their aid to sustain the tottering institution, to dishearten the friends of liberty in the prospect. The law of nature and the promises of God afford ample encouragement that slavery is short-lived. From the rank soil of cities may be expected to break out physical revolution, with its riots, its émeutes and its bloodshed. But not to such movements do we look. The moral revolutions through which the cause of Freedom shall triumph spring up among the yeomanry, and gain in the country the vigorous, sturdy growth, to which at last the cities must succumb.

It must not be forgotten that the power of sympathy is an essential element in every moral enterprise. This was manifested at the introduction of Christianity, and has been experienced in every age of the world. On the page of ecclesiastical history it is written: "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church;" and on the record of political annals is inscribed: "The voice of my brother's blood cries from the ground!" When Knibb, the missionary, addressed public assemblies in England respecting the atrocities that had been committed in Jamaica, on the property of the mission and the persons of the slaves, he so awakened the sympathy of the British people that they came out in their majesty and decreed the death of colonial slavery. Neither they nor the planters now regret the event. The operation of the Fugitive Slave Bill has awakened, for the first time, a general sympathy in the people of the free States for the victims of oppression. It may be that attempts to enforce this act will be instrumental in deepening this sympathy, until the North shall resolve, as unanimously as did the people of Great Britain, that slavery shall cease. When this state of things arrives, the great body of the planters of the United States will, it is to be hoped, be as considerate as were the planters of the British West Indies, and submit to a dire necessity, fraught as they may afterwards understand with blessings upon themselves and their posterity.

The passage and enforcement of this Bill may justly be looked upon as a persecution of those Christians who conscientiously believe its provisions are contrary to the divine law. They, as well as others, are required to aid in the execution of an enactment that they believe is contrary to the religion of Christ, and are made liable, for refusing so to do, to fines and imprisonment. And as there is no probability that the contest now prevailing between the advocates of the higher law and the supporters of the lower law will cease until the triumph of the first is firmly established, this persecution will probably continue during the whole of this moral warfare. If such persecution is tamely submitted to, other encroachments will doubt-

less be made. It should therefore be resisted by all possible constitutional, legal, and Christian measures, under a sense of obligation to God, and to the laws of the land made in conformity to His supreme law.

The English nation was aroused to action chiefly in consequence of the persecution of the missionaries in Jamaica. This opened the eyes of the nation to the atrocities of slaveholding. The persecution of the colored people of this country, and of their friends, should enkindle equal feeling here. It will do so unless the consciences of men are seared, and their moral sense perverted by the practice of iniquity, the love of money, and the false teachings of ethical and clerical demagogues. In this country, more than in any other, are the people responsible for the continuance of slavery, and for its contaminating influence in Church and State. We choose our law-makers; they are our representatives; and therefore every elector is responsible in a high degree for the prevalence of an unrighteous system, and for the cruel enactments that sustain it.

The Church, as is well known, is deeply implicated in the sin of slaveholding, but few persons are aware of its extent among the various denominations. Our agent in New-Mexico, previous to his departure for that country, published some important statistics on this subject, that show "there is no element by which the down-trodden and bleeding slave is held in durance vile so effective as the ecclesiastical power." We extract the following from the tables published by him:—

Denominations.	Ministers.	Members.	No. of Slaves.
Methodists,*	5,080	1,178,637	219,563
Presbyterians, Old and New Schools,	3,264	833,458	77,000
Baptists,	6,598	812,921	125,000
Campbellites,			101,000
Episcopalians,	1,404	67,550	88,000
Other denominations,			50,000

Total number of slaves held by ministers of the gospel and members of the different Protestant Churches,	660,563
--	---------

The denominations above cited have under their control 89 colleges with 5,495 students, and 26 theological seminaries with about 700 students. Some of these colleges and seminaries have been built and endowed partly by the sale of slaves, and all are looking for slaveholding patronage. When we contemplate the above facts, and consider the influence which the Church and the ministry have in this country, it is

* Of the 219,563 slaves owned in the Methodist Church, the greater portion by far are owned in the Church South. The Church North, however, is by no means guiltless of the blood of the innocent. She has her churches in the South in which slaves are held, and the owners are in good standing. Dr. Durbin writes letters from Philadelphia to the Virginia slaveholders, to convince them that the Church North is in no way connected with Abolitionism, and is in every way worthy of their confidence and support. And since the division of that Church, not a single Conference, quarterly or annual, to our knowledge, in the whole North, has declared slaveholding a bar to Christian communion, though they have been repeatedly solicited so to do.

impossible not to think of the truth contained in the memorable saying of the distinguished Albert Barnes:—

“THERE IS NO POWER OUT OF THE CHURCH THAT COULD SUSTAIN SLAVERY AN HOUR IF IT WERE NOT SUSTAINED IN IT.”

The prominent question now before the nation, it will be acknowledged, is one as much connected with the moral and religious, as with the political interests of the people. The baneful influence of slavery is felt in every department of society, and affects injuriously the spiritual as well as the temporal welfare of men. And it will either uproot and destroy both the political and religious institutions of the country, or be itself destroyed by them. A slaveholding Christianity is as great an anomaly as a slaveholding Democracy. It is therefore a matter of peculiar concern, if “righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people,” to watch with interest the action of ecclesiastical bodies and prominent clerical men, with reference to the part they take in upbuilding or destroying the fair fabric raised by our forefathers. Having recorded the action of various ecclesiastical bodies and clerical gentlemen on the Fugitive Slave Bill, and related the doings of the Methodist Churches and the Society of Friends the past year, on the general subject of slavery, we will now turn our attention to what has been done by other denominations.

The GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PRESBYTERIANS (Old School) is composed of those who consider themselves orthodox *par excellence*. They reside in the slave and free States, are generally pro-slavery, and vie with the Senate of the United States in dogged hostility to anti-slavery action. They profess to believe that slavery is not in itself a sin; that the abuses of the system alone are cognizable by church judicatories; that Christianity has very little to do with the politics of a nation; and that colonization is the chief remedy for ridding the country, in due time, of the institution descended from Abraham and endorsed by the apostles.

This body held their last annual meeting at Cincinnati in May, 1850. Dr. Murray, of New-Jersey, late Moderator, preached the sermon from these words: “A glorious church.” Dr. Leland, of South-Carolina, was elected Moderator for the ensuing year. There were three candidates, all being residents of slave States, and probably slaveholders. Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, who is a conspicuous politician as well as ecclesiastic, and who felt a deep sympathy with Mr. Clay in the success of the compromise measures of the late Congress, moved for a committee to prepare a memorial to Congress expressing the views of the Presbyterian body in the United States in favor of the perpetuity of the Union. The resolution was placed on the docket, although anti-slavery petitions in the Assembly are seldom read, and generally treated with contempt. Subsequently the matter was indefinitely postponed by a vote of 103 to 75.

Rev. Mr. McClure, a delegate to this body from the Congregational “General Association of Massachusetts,” made a communication expressive

of the views of the Association on slavery, accompanied by their "earnest but kind and Christian desire" that the General Assembly would take such action as would soonest and best free* the Church from all connection with it; whereupon Dr. W. L. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, offered the following:—

Resolved, That our delegate to the next General Association of Massachusetts be directed to inform that venerable body that this General Assembly must consider itself the best judge of the action which it is necessary for it to take as to all subjects within its jurisdiction; and that any interference on the part of that General Association with its action upon any subject upon which this General Assembly has taken action, is offensive, and must lead to an interruption of the correspondence which subsists between that Association and the General Assembly.

This resolution was adopted, after a brief debate, with very few dissenting votes.

Dr. Plumer, of Baltimore, formerly of Virginia, was appointed to preach before the next General Assembly, on the subject of—Romanism. This is the preacher who said, at the time the Abolitionists were mobbed, and their houses and churches threatened with conflagration, "If Abolitionists will set the country in a blaze, it is but fair that they should have the first warming of the fire."

The GENERAL ASSEMBLY (New School) met at Detroit, also in May last. The majority of the members connected with this body are Northern men, and profess to take more liberal and scriptural views of theology than the other division of the Presbyterian Church. It contains a respectable minority who entertain anti-slavery sentiments. Some are decided Abolitionists. A few members are from churches in slaveholding States; and several are men who once professed to be Abolitionists, but who have apostatized. It has been the policy of the latter portion to keep the Assembly so far anti-slavery as to draw off from the other body all affected with anti-slavery opinions, and so far pro-slavery as to prevent members from the slave States leaving them.

Nineteen anti-slavery memorials were presented.† They seemed to be more decided in their tone than previously. A resolution was introduced against the *abuses* of slavery. It was proposed, in Congressional style,

* Mr. McClure prefaced the communication by stating that it was not in accordance with his own feelings or views; that he was *under instructions*, and had no alternative, &c.; and after the introduction of the resolution, apologized, expressed regret at the action of the body he represented, and hoped the fraternal relations of the two bodies would not be interrupted. But before he could get out of the house, Dr. R. J. Breckenridge expressed the hope that the delegate who had been appointed to the General Association of next year should remain at home. Dr. Baker, of Texas, the delegate, stated to the Assembly his determination to decline acting under his commission. The course pursued by Mr. McClure seemed to invite these insults. In ecclesiastical pro-slavery bodies as in Congress, doughfaceism invites insult and aggression, whereas gentlemanly frankness and boldness inspire respect.

† Of these, two were from Synods, thirteen from Presbyteries, one from a church, two from private individuals, and one from a body not connected with the Assembly.

to lay all the memorials on the table, but there was too much anti-slavery feeling to allow such a procedure. At length it was agreed that one of the memorials should be read; that any member representing a Synod or Presbytery that had sent up a memorial, might call for the reading of it; and that the whole should be sent to a special committee. Several were read. Before the Assembly adjourned, Dr. Duffield, chairman of the committee, made a long report, accompanied by a set of resolutions. Rev. W. C. Wisner made a minority report, with resolutions. Rev. Mr. Clarke, of Ohio, and Rev. Mr. Spear offered substitute resolutions. The following, being those that accompanied the report of the minority, with material amendments, were finally passed by a vote of 86 ayes to 16 nays:—

Resolved, 1. That we exceedingly deplore the workings of the whole system of slavery as it exists in our country, and is interwoven with the political institutions of the slaveholding States, as fraught with many and great evils to the civil, political and moral interests of those regions where it exists.

2. That the holding our fellow-men in the condition of slavery, except in those cases where it is unavoidable by the laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship, or the demands of humanity, is an offense in the proper import of that term, as used in the Book of Discipline, Ch. I. Sec. 3, which should be regarded and treated in the same manner as other offenses.

3. That the Sessions and Presbyteries are, by the Constitution of our Church, the courts of primary jurisdiction for the trial of offenses.

4. That after this declaration of sentiment, the whole subject of slavery, as it exists in the Church, be referred to the Sessions and Presbyteries, to take such action thereon as in their judgment the laws of Christianity require.*

It was thought at the time that rather ultra anti-slavery resolutions had been passed. Consequently the Southern members entered a protest. The *New-York Evangelist* expressed the belief that the anti-slavery tone of the resolutions was an advance on former acts. The Boston *Congregationalist* thought the doings of the Assembly very gratifying. The Ohio *Central Christian Herald* expressed a belief that all anti-slavery men would approve the doings of the Assembly, though it confessed that "several Southern men voted against the resolutions on the ground that they considered it inexpedient to take any further action on the subject now, and not because they dissented from the positions assumed in them." The *New-York Observer* remarked that both the report of the majority and that of the minority were "conceived in a spirit at once of fidelity and charity. Both leave the sin of slaveholding in individual cases—the one virtually, and the other expressly—to be judged of, and proceeded with, by the Sessions and Presbyteries." The Philadelphia *Christian Observer*, a rank pro-slavery paper, judged differently. "The time for debating the question [slavery] in the Church has passed by," said the editor, and intimated that the resolutions, as passed, meant very little. Rev. Mr. Stiles spoke in vindication of slaveholding, and yet voted for the resolutions.*

* Mr. Stiles was at the time pastor of the Mercer street church, New-York, a Southerner by birth and associations. After the adjournment of the Assembly he published his speech in that body, with an Appendix containing extravagant pro-slavery sentiments. Many of his people were offended, and this circumstance, in

It is obvious enough that the resolutions adopted are unmeaning, and that the action of the Assembly was a retrograde step. We doubt not that the editors who approved the resolutions did it hastily. Some of the anti-slavery members of the Assembly, who rejoiced in the passage of the resolutions, found on closer examination that they had mistaken the shadow for the substance; and the Southern members who made the protest must have felt that the labor had been wholly unnecessary. The fact is, there was a good deal of anti-slavery feeling in the Assembly, so much that the resolutions reported by the majority of the committee could not pass. It was confidently expected that the strong anti-slavery resolutions reported by the minority of the committee would be adopted. A struggle then ensued between the anti-slavery, pro-slavery and conservative portions of the Assembly. Various amendments were proposed, some of which were adopted, and on the final passage of the resolutions both the anti-slavery and pro-slavery members imagined the resolutions had passed substantially as reported. This intelligence was spread abroad, and hence the encomiums of a part of the anti-slavery press. It was found, however, after the smoke of the contest had cleared away, that slavery had escaped with only a slight scratch. The remark of Mr. Stiles, afterwards made, was not far from the truth: "A series of resolutions drawn up by a committee, composed of opposite parties, is always a singularly mixed production."

It will be seen that the SIN of slaveholding is not condemned by the Assembly. The "workings" or "abuses" of the system are merely "deplored." The many and great "evils" are lamented. IT WILL BE SEEN ALSO THAT THE EXCEPTIONS ALLUDED TO IN THE SECOND RESOLUTION WILL BE MADE TO EMBRACE NEARLY EVERY INSTANCE OF SLAVEHOLDING IN THE CHURCH. Sessions and Presbyteries composed of slaveholders (and such will in most cases be the judicatories for the trial of these offenses) will hold that no slaves are held by church-members except where it is "unavoidable by the laws of the State, the obligations of guardianship, or the demands of humanity." What remains then will be considered "an offense," subject to discipline! In view of the whole proceedings, must not the act of the Assembly be considered unworthy of a body of honest men?

The spirit of this General Assembly, as to the slavery question, it has been well observed, "may be judged of by what they refused to do, as by what they did." Be it known, then, that they refused to pass the following, presented by Rev. W. C. Clark, of Ohio:—

Whereas, according to the decision of the General Assembly of 1849, (see Minutes, p. 187,) "the system of slavery, as it exists in these United States, is intrinsically an unrighteous and oppressive system, and is opposed to the prescrip-

connection with other causes of dissatisfaction, led to his resignation. To the astonishment of not a few, Mr. Stiles was immediately appointed a Secretary of the American Bible Society, to labor especially at the South!

tions of the law of God, to the spirit and precepts of the gospel, and to the best interests of humanity;" therefore,

Resolved, That voluntary slaveholding be regarded as presumptive evidence of guilt, and should be treated by the lower judicatories as an offense as defined by the Book of Discipline, Chapter I, Section 3.

They also rejected the following, presented by W. B. F. Smith, an Elder from the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia :—

Resolved, That this Assembly exceedingly deplores the existence of the system of slaveholding in this country, it being in the judgment of the Assembly, *prima facie*, an offense within the meaning of our Book of Discipline.

Resolved, That although the Assembly will not affirm that there are no circumstances in which an individual proved to be a slaveholder may be placed that will take away from him the guilt of this offense, yet in the judgment of the Assembly, the burden of showing the existence of such circumstances rests upon him.

Resolved, therefore, That the Assembly, in the exercise of its constitutional prerogative, and in the performance of an enjoined duty, does hereby bear its solemn testimony against this immorality, and urges upon the lower judicatories to deal with it according to the principles herein indicated, in conformity with the rules of discipline of the Church.

Surely anti-slavery men in this Assembly will not be satisfied with such a weak and inefficient set of resolutions; and editors who have commended them will, on maturer reflection, form a more correct opinion of their impotence and mockery, as it respects the ultimate result. Better for the Assembly to come out boldly, as their brethren of the Old School have, in defense of the system, and denial of the necessity of discipline, in defiance of what Presbyterians of both schools declared, when they composed a united body.*

It will be useful to refresh the memory of the Christian public with the doings of the General Assembly in past times. In 1794, when religious men vied with statesmen in stigmatizing slavery as it deserves, and in efforts to bring about its abolition, the General Assembly adopted the following as a note to the eighth commandment :—

1 Tim. i. 10.—The law is made for man-stealers. This crime among the Jews exposed the perpetrators of it to capital punishment, (Exodus xxi. 16,) and the apostle here classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or in retaining them in it. Stealers of men are all those who bring off slaves or freemen, and *keep, sell, or buy* them. To steal a freeman,

* The General Assembly, at their meeting at Utica, N. Y., May, 1851, after a debate on the slavery question, adopted by "an overwhelming majority," the following resolution. Very little other business was attended to. Both the Old School and New School papers congratulate their readers that the subject that has so long agitated the Church is happily settled. One of them states that President Fillmore and Attorney General Crittenden "markedly congratulated some of the Commissioners, at Utica, on the results of the discussion; and felt that its effects would be widely and variedly beneficial."

"That the Assembly have reason to be thankful to Divine Providence for the wisdom and prudence vouchsafed to the last Assembly, in coming to conclusions on this vexed question, which have so generally met with the acquiescence of the Church at this crisis; and that it seems obviously our privilege and duty at the present session to leave the whole subject as it was placed by that action, without further agitation, and to unite in devout thanksgiving, for such an adjustment of this subject, as leaves us undividedly and undistractedly to give our energies to the great work of our Master."

says Grotius, is the highest kind of theft. In other instances we only steal human property, but when we steal or retain men in slavery, we seize those who, in common with ourselves, are constituted, by the original grant, lords of the earth.

In 1815, the General Assembly "assure all churches under their care, that they view with the deepest concern any vestiges (!) of slavery which may exist in our country."

In 1816, after the invention of Whitney's cotton gin, and the consequent increase of trade, which seemed to bewitch the people both in and out of the Church, the General Assembly, while it called slavery "a mournful evil," directed that the above note should be erased.

In 1818, however, the following resolution was adopted :—

"We consider the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature ; as *utterly* inconsistent with the laws of God, which are, to love our neighbor as ourselves ; and as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the gospel of Christ, which enjoins that all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." . . . And, "it is manifestly the duty of all Christians who enjoy the light of the present day . . . as speedily as possible to efface this blot on our holy religion and to obtain the complete abolition of slavery throughout Christendom, and if possible, throughout the world."

The above resolutions were adopted before the division of the Presbyterian Church.

In 1846, the General Assembly (New School) resolved that "the system of slavery is intrinsically an unrighteous and oppressive system, and is opposed to the prescriptions of the law of God, to the spirit and precepts of the gospel, and to the best interests of humanity. . . . Yet we would not undertake to determine the degree of moral turpitude on the part of individuals involved in it."

They also resolved that they would not "pronounce a judgment of general and promiscuous condemnation, nor withhold ecclesiastical and Christian fellowship from them," (all who stood in the relation of masters and slaves;) and that they believed, "that separation and secession among the churches and their members, are not the methods that God approves and sanctions for the reformation of his Church."*

In 1849, this body resolved :—

That in the judgment of this Assembly, these declarations of former General Assemblies bear an explicit, frank, honest, and honorable testimony against the evils of slavery, and they ought to be known and read of all men.

The AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS, the largest and most influential missionary association in this country,

* This seems a very loose and unscriptural mode of expression, and a determination at variance with the Scripture, as it regards discipline. Because, they could not see their way clear to pronounce a condemnation on *all* slaveholders, and withhold fellowship from *all*, they decline doing it with respect to *any*. And God, it is intimated, does not approve of "separation and secession among the churches." This is said without reservation! But what says the Scripture? "Wherefore, come out from among them, [the "world and workers of iniquity."—*Clarke* ; "ought that pertained to idolatry or iniquity."—*Scott*,] and be ye *separate*, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing." Why the General Assembly should resolve that they would not withhold Christian fellowship from all who stood in the relation of "slaves," does not appear.

took no action at its last annual meeting in aid of emancipation. A printed circular, signed by several ministers and laymen of the State of New-York, containing strictures upon the Board for its supposed pro-slavery character, was, it seems, distributed among the members. Dr. Anderson made a public reply to it, and stated that the signers to the circular were "*known as friends and patrons of the American Missionary Union*;" meaning, as is supposed, the American Missionary Association, which is avowedly and consistently an anti-slavery body of Christians. It is true that some of the signers are known to be contributors to the treasury of the Association, but the circular was prepared, we learn, without the knowledge or concurrence of its Committee; and it is somewhat gratuitous in the Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M. to cast an oblique censure upon another missionary Society, which appears to be provoking the old Board to good works.

We concur with the signers to the circular in several of the exceptions taken, but all we have to do with the subject relates to that part of the circular which refers to the doings of the Board on the subject of slavery. They say, in reference to the annual meeting of the Board at Brooklyn:—

By the action of that meeting, we understand it to be the adopted sentiment of the A. B. C. F. M., that polygamy, war, caste, slavery, and civil oppression, are sins of the State, rather than of individuals; and hence, that for such things men are not to be reproved, as they are for lying, Sabbath-breaking, fraud, &c. In regard to professed converts from heathenism, the Board teach, (see their Report, p. 7,) that being gathered into churches, then "the master may be prepared to break the bonds of the slave, and the oppressive ruler led to dispense justice to the subject, and the proud Brahmin fraternally to embrace the man of low caste, &c."

The circular intimates nothing in the above extracts, that is not true, as the report of the Board alluded to will show. Slave masters are in the churches gathered by its missionaries, among the Cherokees and Choctaws; "oppressive rulers" are or were in those at the Sandwich Islands; and "proud Brahmins" in those of India, all welcomed and cherished as "children of the great household of God!"

Complaint is made that the Board send or appoint agents in communities of slaveholders, to solicit co-operation and funds, thus acknowledging them to be Christian brethren, countenancing them in the wicked system of slavery, and accepting the gains of oppression for the treasury of the Lord. These Christian ministers and laymen also complain that slaves are hired at the mission stations of their masters, and that thus a sanction is given to the conduct of those who rob men of their wages. And, in a respectful manner and kind spirit, they implore the Board to discountenance the practices of which they complain. Surely such remonstrants deserve the thanks of the Board and its friends, and not their sneers or rebuke, for their fidelity, especially when the Board is—*slowly* it must be acknowledged—abandoning the ground heretofore

taken with regard to the evil practices of which such just complaint is made.

The AMERICAN HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY sustains, at the present time, sixty-three missionaries in the slave States,* most if not all of whom, it is believed, receive slaveholders to church fellowship, and collect funds indiscriminately, as they are able, for the common treasury of the Society. The facts that its missionaries are steadily increasing in slave States, that they abstain from all interference with slavery in the churches to which they minister, and that the Society takes no steps, so far as the public knows, to induce these churches to refrain from affording countenance to the slaveholding system, and to institute discipline and refuse fellowship with reference to slaveholders, have aroused the attention of anti-slavery Christians in various parts of the country. And in view of what they deem a tacit connivance at the slave system on the part of the Society, some feel constrained to withdraw personal services, and others pecuniary aid, from a missionary association they otherwise most cordially approve. In evidence of this we extract the following:—

The *Northwestern Gazetteer*, for Feb. 27, contains the following Memorial to the Executive Committee of the American Home Missionary Society. We understand that the movement commenced with a few of the Society's missionaries in Iowa, but it now promises to be somewhat extensive. The publication of the Memorial is accompanied by an *Appeal to the Friends and Patrons, the Missionaries and Churches contributing to or aided by the American Home Missionary Society*.

“MEMORIAL.

“*To the Executive Committee of the Home Missionary Society:*

The undersigned Ministers, Elders, and Deacons of churches aided by or contributing to your Society, respectfully pray that you will adopt in Committee, a rule of appropriations under which churches in slave States, applying for aid in supporting the gospel, shall be asked whether the members are allowed to hold slaves, and if so, that no aid be granted such churches hereafter applying, until the objection shall be removed.”

We rejoice in this movement, because it comes from a right source, and is eminently kind towards the body which it memorializes. It seeks to detach the Missionary Society from the support of slavery, because it believes the enslaving of men to be sin, and because it is believed that the unrebuked fellowshiping of the slaveholder as a good Christian brother, counteracts all the efforts made by the friends of the Society for the overthrow of this sin.

The conductors of this Society are desirous, we doubt not, of being as anti-slavery in their operations as they think prudence will admit. In the “*Home Missionary*” for November, 1850, is an excellent article in reply to one of the Society's correspondents, who desired them to send missionaries who would “let politics alone,” and “let slavery alone.” The Secretaries say:—

* The statement made in the Annual Report of the A. H. M. S., with reference to the number of their missionaries in Southern States, will mislead some, unless they reflect that the distribution is made in the Report according to the *geographical* divisions of the country, instead of the popular use of terms. In the Report 17 are stated to be located in “Southern States,” and 488 in “Western States and Territories.” Included in the last division are 46 in the slave States Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri.

There is no use in blinking the fact that this admitted evil is a great hindrance to the spread of religion, to education, to moral and social prosperity; and no one will deny that the gospel is its most direct and appropriate remedy. But if the preacher of the gospel be prohibited from touching the evil with the remedy, where is the inducement to send him? Such appeals for missionaries react against those who make them. They discourage missionary effort by taking away one of its great motives. They turn away missionaries to other fields. They indirectly injure those ministers who are laboring in slave States, implying that they are all silent on this subject; whereas, there are not a few whose mouths are not and cannot be shut, but who are, quietly and prudently indeed, but yet faithfully and successfully, trying the potency of the gospel upon this great evil. If our friends in the slave States wish us to send missionaries, or wish to induce missionaries to come to them, they must not prescribe any conditions which shall fetter the free action of intelligent and God-fearing men, acting on their sincere convictions of the nature and requirements of the religion of Christ.

Admirable. But how can a Society, whose organ utters such a "certain sound," sustain correspondents, or support missionaries preaching statedly to churches composed in part or wholly of slaveholders, without rebuking or disciplining them for their sin? Such appeals as are given above, we are told, "turn away missionaries to other fields." Doubtless. The more conscientious the missionary, the more likely to be thus affected. And will not the attempt of the officers, thus to combine the utterance of such noble truths with the support of ministers preaching unrebukingly to slaveholding churches, divert the sympathy and aid of the Christian community from the Society itself? Already has similar inconsistency deprived it of excellent missionaries, produced remonstrances, alienated confidence, and, as we believe, grieved the Holy Spirit.

The ground assumed by the apologists of the Society for the silence of its missionaries in slave States on the subject of slavery, we understand to be this: If the missionaries are required to preach against the sin of slaveholding, and to refuse to tolerate it in the churches to which they minister, they will be driven away, and thus churches and community be deprived of gospel privileges. A similar defense is set up by the American Tract Society, and the American Sunday-School Union, for declining to publish any work on the sinfulness of American slavery.

Undoubtedly there would be difficulty. But the vital question to be met lies here: Is it right to preach an emasculated gospel? The great Founder of Christianity and his chosen apostles—was this *their* practice? Among idolaters, were their lips silent on the sin of idolatry? Among the lascivious, did they omit to denounce licentiousness? Nay, verily. In all its fulness and integrity, at every hazard, they preached the GOSPEL, the WHOLE GOSPEL. The "sapping and mining" process was no device of theirs. It was not their policy, for the sake of quiet, or of maintaining their place and influence in any community, to be silent on the specific sins there cherished. Difficulty in proclaiming a true gospel is not confined to the region where American slavery maintains its monuments. "I came," said Jesus Christ, "not to send peace, but a sword." It is the predicted effect of Christianity to excite anxious inquiry, stir up opposi-

tion, snap the closest ties of life, and reveal to a man his deadliest foes in his own household.

From neither the Bible, History, nor Reason, can we draw encouragement in preaching a gospel that shall be silent on the specific and crying sins of men, in the hope of retaining position and influence among them. Not by sapping and mining, by manœuvring and concealment of the whole counsel of God, has the Church achieved its triumphs. Its great Head reached the crown through the cross; and always the seed of the Church has been the blood of the martyrs. It is the winds of opposition, produced by faithful preaching, that carry the gospel truth far and wide, and in the result produce rich harvests. Is it not then a short-sighted policy, as well as an unsafe departure from the example of Christ and his apostles, to inculcate any thing less than a full gospel? Do not both principle and policy unite in showing that success waits only on uncompromising fidelity and courage? And shall not Christians among us insist that the missionaries whom they sustain be found faithful to their trust; and that the Societies to which they give their contributions shall keep themselves clear from the blood of all men, by refusing in any way to be implicated in, or give countenance to, the guilt of churches involved in slaveholding?

Is it said, the responsibility of admitting slaveholders to the privileges of the Church, and neglecting to discipline them, rests upon the churches to which the missionaries of the Home Missionary Society preach? It is true that the churches, or the sessions of the churches, have the decision of these questions; but the officiating minister is the moderator of the church or the session, often as such has the casting vote, and usually possesses an influence sufficient to turn the scale when there is a division of sentiment. The missionary cannot then, any more than the Society that sustains him, throw the responsibility of admitting slaveholders to church privileges, or neglecting to discipline such offenders, from himself, upon the church to which he ministers. He may intimate, in his discourses and conversation, his opposition to slavery, and its inconsistency with Christianity; but if, at the same time, he recognizes the Christian character of slaveholders, admits them to the membership of the Church, administers to them the holy ordinances of the Church, he acts in an individual as well as ministerial capacity, and sanctions the sin of slaveholding. If he merely *preached* to such persons with Christian fidelity, the case would be otherwise; but when he goes beyond this, and aids in introducing slaveholders to the Church, or fellowships them as Christians in good and regular standing, both he, and the Society that sustains him, with a full knowledge and approbation of his conduct, must be considered greatly censurable.

It is acknowledged by all who profess to believe that slavery is a moral evil, that it will be eventually subverted by the gospel. Even men who

claim that slavery was tolerated under the Mosaic dispensation, and that Christ and the apostles did not forbid it, consent to this. But it is obvious that an exposition of the gospel that tolerates such an iniquity cannot be efficacious in subverting it. A different kind of exposition is necessary before the evil will be seen in all its atrocity, before it will be universally considered utterly inconsistent with a Christian profession. The axe must be laid at the root of the tree. A gospel thus understood and preached, and none other, will be the means of the "pulling down of strongholds," with respect to slavery and all other iniquities. It is because we feel the truth of these sentiments, and deeply lament the course taken by those who think otherwise, that we are constrained to expostulate with the managers of societies who, while professing to be anti-slavery in their principles, encourage the practice of slaveholding, and thus, as we believe, make the gospel, which is anti-slavery in all its principles and tendencies, a minister of sin.

Some, we know, are entangled in their apprehensions of duty, on account of the obligation resting upon them, as they think, not to introduce questions of moral reform not contemplated at the formation of the associations or societies with which they and persons connected with slavery are confederated. They reason thus: The constitutions of these societies are similar to the Constitution of our government; by uniting ourselves to them, we have virtually consented that we would co-operate to carry them on to the exclusion of every thing not specifically named; and we have no right now to insist upon measures that will of necessity drive away those who have equal rights with ourselves. In answer to such objections it may be said, the majority of a Society have an undoubted right to conduct its affairs agreeably to the intent of its founders, provided that intent is consistent with the gospel of Christ. If they find that the principles of association restrict them in the performance of duty, or require them to do manifest wrong, they have a right to revise the articles of association, and so amend them as to give free scope to their obligations to God and man. Disaffected members can retire without just cause of complaint against their associates. This is, we believe, a correct principle with regard to civil and ecclesiastical associations. It cannot be supposed that God will sanction men in doing wrong, or refraining from doing right. Christians, in their associated as well as in their individual capacity, are under solemn obligations to inculcate truth unmixed with error, and, both by precept and example, to exhibit Christianity in its entire strictness, spirituality and thoroughness. Times and seasons may be innocently selected according to the judgment of men, but who will dare suppress any part of the commission given to the ambassadors of Christ?

Rev. John G. Fee, of Kentucky, formerly one of the missionaries of the Society, which he left because of what he deemed its pro-slavery charac-

ter, and connected himself with the American Missionary Association, has during the past year gathered a second church in that State on anti-slavery principles. He has not found it an easy task, but in the success that has attended his efforts, he finds evidence of the Divine approbation. He is a witness to the fact that an anti-slavery gospel can be preached in a slaveholding community, and that under it slaveholders will renounce the sin, and embrace a religion that affords no countenance to chattel slavery. Mr. Fee reports to the Society that employs him as follows:—

The good accomplished here is not confined to the little church gathered under so many adverse circumstances, but is felt by all denominations of Christians, and in all the surrounding country is agitating the public mind on the subject of slavery, and eliciting from many ministers and churches sermons and expressions on the subject, and on the duty of Christians to withhold all fellowship from the slaveholder.

Mr. Fee, speaking of a member of his church, employed as a colporteur for the Society with which he is connected, reports:—

One of our members is travelling over the State as a colporteur, visiting all classes from house to house, talking with them freely on the subject of personal religion, selling the Tract Society's publications, giving Bibles to such slaves as can read, talking with slaveholders and non-slaveholders about the sinfulness of slaveholding, and the guilt of fellowshipping it in the Christian Church, and leaving at almost every house anti-slavery documents, illustrative of these points. And now we want a more complete assortment of anti-slavery tracts.

The colporteur alluded to was arrested at the instance of a member of the Baptist Church, on a charge of enticing away a slave, but on trial was acquitted. Another person has since taken his place, and is laboring successfully, distributing the Bible,* Address to Non-Slaveholders, and other anti-slavery publications. The Committee of the A. and F. A. S. S. have in press a revised edition of a manual, containing an examination of the passages in Scripture claimed by the defenders of slavery as sustaining the practice of slaveholding; a comprehensive tract, showing in the light of the Bible, the sinfulness of slaveholding; and another tract on the duty of Christians to have no church fellowship with slaveholders. All of them are written by Mr. Fee, and are intended for circulation by the anti-slavery citizens of slave States.

* In a speech before the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1850, Hon. Abbott Lawrence, Minister of the United States at the Court of St. James, made the following excellent remark: "I say that it is a duty to place this book in the hands of every human being that can read it; and if there are those who cannot read it, it is our duty to teach them to read and understand its inspirations. [Hear, hear.]" It is proper to say here that the American Bible Society intrusts the distribution of the Bible to its auxiliaries. Should it not see that, in case of the neglect of any auxiliary to distribute the Bible to slaves who can read, or who, if possessed of a Bible or Testament, would learn to read or be read to, that measures be taken to supply the delinquency? It has been understood that the Society keeps a Bible "Fund for Slaves," but this is a mistake; no separate account is kept. All the money given to the Society, whether for "slaves" or other objects, goes into a common treasury, and none is set apart specially to furnish the slaves with Bibles. The Society gives Bibles liberally to all who apply, if proper subjects of this charity, but does not undertake to supply the slaves. This is, however, done by the American Missionary Association, which has employed colporteurs for that very purpose.

We have previously mentioned the action of the AMERICAN MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION on the Fugitive Slave Bill. The missionaries and col-porteurs of this Society are exerting a good anti-slavery influence in Africa, Siam, the Sandwich Islands, Jamaica, Canada, and in the different States of the Union. They preach to rulers and people on the sinfulness of slavery, the slave-trade, and oppression in all its forms, and their labors have been very successful. The Kaw-Mendi mission, Africa, has been very successful in abolishing the internal slave-trade in all that region of country, and putting an end to devastating wars which are often made to obtain slaves to sell to the foreign traders who hover on the coast. Besides a large number of foreign missionaries, the Association sustains upwards of twenty home missionaries, who are exerting a beneficial influence in building up Sunday-schools and churches that regard anti-slavery principles an important part of Christianity.

A Convention at Cincinnati during the past year formed the WESTERN HOME AND FOREIGN MISSIONARY ASSOCIATION. It is disconnected with slavery, and auxiliary to the American Missionary Association. No slaveholder is admitted to membership. This Society will not contribute its funds to missionaries or churches that "support, countenance or tolerate slavery," and it will "endeavor particularly to discountenance slavery, by refusing to receive the known fruits of unrequited labor, or to welcome to its employment those who hold their fellow-beings as slaves."

A Christian Anti-Slavery Convention was held at Ottawa, Ill., in June last, which adopted the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That the religious organizations—churches, ecclesiastical bodies, and missionary associations, *which do not array their influence against* American slavery, are responsible for its existence and continuance, with all its horrors and abominations; and all those who are in connection and fellowship with those bodies are individually partakers in the guilt.

2. *Resolved*, That the light which sixteen years' extended and faithful discussion has thrown upon the subject of human rights, has brought the churches and great religious organizations into a position where they must either abjure American slavery by disfellowshipping those who practise or defend it; or forfeit all claim to the Christian name, and to a consistent regard for the distinguishing tenets of an evangelical faith.

3. *Resolved*, That no legislative enactments can make it wrong to aid in the escape of fugitive slaves from bondage. And in the event the bill now pending before the United States Senate for the recapture of fugitive slaves becomes a law, we shall feel under obligations to obey God rather than man, disregarding its requirements.

The General Association of Illinois, at its last annual meeting, discussed the relation of mission Boards to slavery, and passed the following resolutions:—

That it is absurd to expect that public sentiment will ever condemn any practice as wrong and sinful, so long as it finds countenance among the leading evangelical churches of the community.

That it is the imperative duty of the Home Mission Society to extend no further aid to churches which do not take the ground that slaveholding is *prima facie* evidence against a man's Christian character.

That the A. B. C. F. M. ought to sustain no missionary or missionary churches which do not pledge themselves to eradicate the evil from their respective bodies,

as speedily as sound wisdom will permit, and that it is the duty of the Board to announce publicly their determination not to sustain them.

That a neglect on the part of these Boards to take speedy and decisive action against slavery, hitherto corrupting the gospel through their instrumentality, must destroy our confidence, and that of the churches we represent, in their trustworthiness for managing the missionary funds of the Church.

A Christian Anti-Slavery Convention was held at Medina, Ohio, soon after, composed of delegates from many denominations. They went thoroughly into the matter of considering and discussing the duty of protesting against American slavery. No permanent Society was formed, but the members of the Convention pledged themselves to separate from all churches that fellowship slaveholders.

At a Convention of New-England Baptists, held at Lowell, Mass., a Constitution was formed, the third article of which is as follows:—"This Society shall be entirely disconnected from slavery in all its forms, and shall not receive the known avails of oppression into its treasury."

THE AMERICAN BAPTIST FREE MISSION SOCIETY maintains, strictly, its anti-slavery character. It has a mission at Haiti that is exerting a good influence, and the college, founded and sustained by the Society, at McGrawville, N. Y., is said to be in a flourishing condition. A colored gentleman received an appointment of Professor in the institution, and the college aims not only to promote sound education, but to discountenance caste, and all opposition to freedom.

It is exceedingly gratifying to learn that students in colleges and members of theological seminaries, instead of being blinded or palsied by aged pro-slavery teachers, are using their own judgments with regard to the principles they shall adopt and the measures they will pursue with reference to the great reforms of the day. Within a few weeks, a petition has been presented in the Senate of Massachusetts, and referred to a special committee, from one of the "schools of the prophets." It is as follows:—

To the Honorable the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

The undersigned, members of the Theological Seminary in Andover, believing that the recent Act of Congress, entitled an "Act to amend and supplementary to the Act entitled an Act respecting fugitives from justice and other persons escaping from the service of their masters," endangers the personal liberty of a portion of the inhabitants of this Commonwealth; believing moreover that the spirit and the provisions of said Act contravene the moral sentiments of a majority of our citizens and the law of God, do respectfully petition your honorable body—

First,—to adopt such measures as your wisdom may dictate and your constitutional obligations allow, for securing those safeguards of personal liberty which rightfully belong to the citizens of a free and Christian State; and second,—to request the Senators and Representatives of this State in Congress to use their best efforts to secure the immediate repeal of said Act.

J. H. LORING, and 58 others.

Another gratifying evidence that the young men at Andover, preparing for active service in the Church, are self-poised on moral subjects, is found in the fact that the Rhetorical Society, at a meeting to consider the question, "Ought the North to aid the South in the recovery of fugitive slaves?" decided by an overwhelming majority in the negative.

The Slave Power has made rapid strides within a few years. On the

annexation of Texas, and the dismemberment of Mexico, the perpetualists claimed a great triumph, and many persons feared that we were doomed to be a slaveholding nation for centuries to come. The arrogance of the oligarchy knew no bounds. But Providence interposed. The Omnipotent seemed to say of slavery, in the language of Holy Writ, "Here shall thy proud waves be stayed." California was admitted into the Union as a free State. Southern politicians exhibited much wrath, and made violent threats, but a large part of them were soothed, and their pride gratified, by the passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill. They took counsel of their "sober second thoughts," and deemed the best part of valor to be discretion. "If we cannot extend slavery," said they, "over unlimited territory, and have an indefinite number of new slave States, we will make a hunting ground of the free States, compel the freemen of the North to help us recover our runaways, and meantime concert measures for the introduction of slavery into New-Mexico and Utah. The North, headed by Daniel Webster, appeared to acquiesce, and exult in the cry, "The Union is preserved, trade will flourish, and the agitation of the vexed question will cease." Vain confidence! New elements of agitation were introduced by the compromise project, and there is no probability that the controversy will cease while slavery exists. Freedom and slavery are and must be antagonistic. Not even a dissolution of the Union would put an end to the warfare. Freedom must triumph! The contest may be long and fierce, but the issue is certain. Let this conviction sustain and animate the friends of liberty. Meantime we may glance at what is being done to sustain the tottering institution at the South.

The slaveholding States are devising stringent measures for the removal of the free people of color from their territory. Colonization, ever ready to afford its aid to such schemes, has recommended a line of government steamers, ostensibly for commercial purposes, but really to convey the free blacks in large numbers to Africa, at the expense of the country. This is done while Mr. Clay, the President of the Colonization Society, avows in effect, what is a notorious fact, that heretofore as many colored persons have been carried to Liberia as could be taken care of with safety and convenience. In speaking of "these poor creatures," Mr. Clay says:—

If we had thrown some fifteen or twenty thousand a year of free people of color upon the coast of Africa, it would have been impossible to provide suitably for them, and they would have perished by famine.*

Rev. R. J. Breckenridge, in a discourse delivered before the Kentucky Colonization Society, at Frankfort, on the 6th February, 1851, says:—

Hitherto they (the free blacks) have been found willing to emigrate, as rapidly as the means at the disposal of the various Societies made it proper, or the condition of the several colonies made it prudent, to send them.

* Speech at the annual meeting of the Am. Colonization Society, Jan. 21, 1851.

This is what the Abolitionists have always said, and yet they have been reproached for placing hindrances in the way of the emigration of colored people. These "hindrances" have been the presentation of truth. Mr. C. and Mr. B. now come forward, and vouch for one of the statements thus made by anti-slavery men. Abolitionists have never been opposed to voluntary emigration. They believe that every colored person has as undoubted a right to emigrate to California, Oregon, Jamaica, Liberia, or elsewhere, where business or other motives may lead him, as white citizens have. But so far as the colonization scheme contemplates emancipation for the purpose of removal to Africa, leaving the colored man to choose only between slavery or expatriation; and so far as it contemplates the removal of free blacks because, as Mr. Clay once said, they are "nuisances," and disaffect the slave population, there have been and will be insuperable objections. There are also objections of another sort. So long as slavery exists in this country, it is important that influential persons of color should, even at a sacrifice, remain here, advocating the rights of their brethren, and showing by their example the capacity of the colored man to enjoy and improve our civil and religious institutions. Until freedom is universally enjoyed, they cannot be spared either by their brethren or their friends.

But no statement respecting Liberia has equalled those made by Lieut. Forbes of the British Navy, in his recent work, entitled "Dahomey and the Dahomans." He was the fellow-traveller of the lamented African explorer, Duncan, in his embassy for the suppression of the slave-trade. He accuses Liberia of giving countenance and aid to slavery, as will be seen by the following extract:—

In Liberia there is as much, if not more, domestic slavery—that is, the buying and selling of God's image—as in the parent States of America, over which flaunts the flag of Liberty. It is difficult to see the necessity or the justice of the negro who escapes from slavery on one side, crossing the Atlantic to enslave his sable prototype on the other, yet such is the case; and so long as it lasts, notwithstanding the attractive reports that emanate from this new Republic, it cannot be held as an example of future good, but, if possible, should be re-modelled, even if at the expense of internal revolution, or even total annihilation. I doubt if many benevolent Christians in this country are aware, that the model Republic is, in reality, a new name and form for slavery in enslaved Africa, and, until the system be altered, totally undeserving of the high support and liberal charity it receives from the benevolence of Englishmen. The system of domestic slavery is by no means confined to the Liberian portion of civilized Africa. Pawns (as the fashion terms the slaves on the Gold Coast) are received and held by Englishmen indirectly, and are to all intents and purposes their slaves. The plan adopted is this: The merchant takes unto himself a *femme du pays*, and she manages his establishment. Nor does he inquire how she hires his servants. Her mode is to accept pawns, *i. e.*, purchase slaves, by receiving man, woman, and child in liquidation of debt; in other words, selling goods to native merchants, who, for convenience, leave slaves in payment. These pawns are as directly slaves to their master as any slaves in the United States, but cannot be sold out of the country. I myself am aware of one *femme du pays* of a British merchant being the owner of forty pawns, who perform the household and other services of the master, and are, except in name, his slaves.

Since this Report was prepared, we perceive that the Executive Committee of the American Colonization Society have publicly denied the

X women of the country

truth of Lieut. Forbes's statement. They appeal to the Constitution and Laws of Liberia, and to the testimony of the Recording Secretary of the Society, who has resided there, in proof that *slavery is not allowed*. They also produce letters from an officer of the British squadron, that the slave-trade has been extinguished; and from another officer, that "no such thing as domestic slavery exists, in any shape, amongst the citizens of the Republic." Lieut. Forbes, we perceive, has reiterated his statement. He did not assert that slavery is legalized or exists openly in Liberia, but states that it is an *evasion* of the law, disguised under another name.

Mr. Clay professes to support the colonization scheme partly because it tends to the suppression of the foreign slave-trade. His humane feelings are outraged by its atrocities, and he considers it a disgrace to the civilized world, while he consents to the far more abominable domestic slave-trade, and to the seizure and re-enslavement of his own countrymen who have tasted of the sweets of liberty.

The African mail steamer project does not find favor with all the slave-holding politicians. The Naval Committee of the House of Representatives reported in favor of the scheme, several newspapers advocated it, but nothing further was done in Congress on the subject.*

It is apparent, and the declaration of Mr. Clay corroborates the fact, that colonization cannot be regarded, as some persons affect to regard it, as a remedy for slavery. The annual removal of one fourth of the increase of the slaves would, he acknowledges, have produced a famine in Liberia. Is it not time then that every sensible person in the country abandoned the chimera of putting an end to slavery by colonizing its victims? Let colored citizens, if duty calls, go to any portion of the earth where they can improve their condition; let benevolent persons assist them, if they please, as they would other citizens under like circumstances; but it is time that every intelligent man abandoned the notion of aiding the work of emancipation, or the removal of prejudice, by liberating slaves on condition that they go to Africa, or urging free people of color to forsake their native land in order to secure good treatment on a foreign shore. Whatever may be said to the contrary, the colonization scheme was devised and has been sustained chiefly to "rid the country of the free negroes." Politicians and ministers of the gospel have united in this unholy alliance, caring less about the welfare of the colored man than the furtherance of a plan to "separate the races." Here and there a friend of "African colonization" may be found who is also a true friend of the people of color; but the great body of its supporters, instead of laboring to make the residence of the people of color here agreeable to them and the community, insist that the two races cannot dwell together on this continent, and that, as

* This project had its origin in a memorial to Congress of Joseph Bryan, of Alabama, and his associates, which was published, with a circular, by the American Colonization Society. The plot has been exposed in the *Evening Post* of August 3, 1850.

"prejudice is invincible," the blacks must be expatriated for the convenience of the Anglo-Saxon race.* Slaveholders—and it is they who have been the principal managers of the Society from the beginning—care very little what becomes of its victims, so that their slaves be freed from the contaminating and disaffecting sight of men of their own color in freedom.

It may be well to give some specimens of the cruelties practised in order to oppress and drive away free people of color from slave States. In the city of Washington, which is still disgraced by the existence of slavery and the domestic slave-trade, many of the free people of color are respectable property-holders; their property is taxed the same as white citizens, and thus they have contributed their share to build up the capital of the nation. In fact, they have contributed more than their just proportion, for although their property is taxed for school purposes, not a single school facility is extended to them!†

In Maryland, where there are 50,000 free blacks, it has been proposed to have a clause inserted in the new Constitution to *compel* all free blacks and mulattoes, after a specified day, to leave the State, empowering the Governor, should they refuse, to send them, *nolens volens*, to Liberia. The Chairman of the Committee on Colored Population, in the Constitutional Convention, has reported in favor of the above, and also that after the adoption of the new Constitution they shall be incapable of purchasing or holding real estate; all deeds, wills, &c., purporting to convey to them real estate, shall be null and void, not to affect existing titles, but leases of real estate to them not to exceed one year to be valid; no slaves to be manumitted except on condition of leaving the State within thirty days thereafter; no colored person to come into the State to reside.

In Missouri the laws are very severe against free people of color. It is stated in the *St. Louis Republican* that four negroes, lately confined in jail, upon a charge of being in the State without a license, and who were unable to pay their fines, were flogged, by order of the County Court, and turned loose, with orders to leave the State in three days. We had hoped that there was too much humanity in St. Louis to have allowed such an atrocious procedure. Is freedom deemed a crime there?‡

* The New-York *Tribune* advocates colonization as a means of abolishing the African slave-trade, and as affording an opportunity for the free blacks to show that by themselves they are capable of improvement! The editor, like many other persons, we are sorry to say, seems disposed to yield to the unchristian prejudice against color, instead of opposing it and giving its subjects equal rights here, and the opportunity to rise by their own merits. What sane man doubts that if all disabilities were removed, colored men in large numbers would show their capacity and disposition to sustain themselves and their families as good citizens in the land of their birth?

† *National Era*, June 20, 1850.

‡ In a late paper, we noticed that a rum-seller in Platte county, Mo., who had sold a quart of whiskey at a store to a slave, which occasioned him to get drunk, fall from a horse, and get frozen to death, had to pay, on a suit by the slaveholder, "a widow lady," \$800, the value of the slave.

"A Southern Clergyman" says, in the *New-York Observer*: "The present law of South Carolina forbids the migration of any free negro into the State. If he refuses to quit, he shall be whipped at the discretion of the Court; and if he still refuses, he shall be sold as a slave." Such is the mercy of the Palmetto State!

The Council of the Cherokee Nation, not to be outdone by white slaveholders, have imposed a heavy tax on all free negroes and mulattoes residing in the Nation. Some of the Cherokee Indians are, it is well known, slaveholders; and several of these, together with about an equal number of slaves, are members of the church gathered and taught by the missionaries of the American Board, whose Secretary stated, a few years since, that "the policy of the missionaries has been to preach the gospel, without aiming to exert any direct influence on the subject of slavery." What sort of a gospel is that?

We have previously stated that Congress, at its last session, passed a bill prohibiting the importation of slaves into the District of Columbia from any of the slave States, for the purpose of sale. Many persons have supposed that the bill went farther, and abolished the slave-trade in the District. But this is a mistake. The Southerners refused to make any such concession. While they were willing to abolish the coffles and the pens, so conspicuous at the national capital in the eyes of foreigners, the trade in the District remains as heretofore in all its horrors. Hon. Preston King asked leave to introduce a bill for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, but it was refused by a vote of 109 nays to 52 yeas. Many Northern members dodged the question.

We find in the *Journal of Commerce* the following statement of monstrous cruelty by an infuriated slaveholder, which reminds us of the graphic delineation of the contagious influence of slaveholding ferocity in Jefferson's Notes on Virginia:—

Captain Sidney Lain, having beaten a negro woman most unmercifully yesterday, in Matthews county, his brother, William Lain, went to his house to remonstrate with him for such cruelty in beating the negro. He told him to leave or he would shoot him, and taking up the gun he shot his brother down without further words; and finding he had not killed him, he reloaded, and placing the muzzle against his body, shot again, which caused death instantly. Great excitement prevails in Matthews county. The murderer was not arrested, and is supposed to have gone North.

The heart is pained at the recital of cruelties inflicted upon unoffending fellow-creatures; yet we feel it a duty to record a specimen of what weekly transpires in Richmond, the capital of the Old Dominion, as the countrymen of Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, Madison, and Marshall delight to call their native State. We extract from the *New-York Tribune*:—

SOUTHERN SLAVERY, BY AN EYE-WITNESS.

RICHMOND, Va., Monday, May 13.

As I was conversing with some Southerners in Washington upon Free Soil, they expressed a desire that I should go South and see slavery as it exists there, and I

would come back freed of all Free Soil notions. One from Florida was particularly anxious that I should go home with him, and he would show me a tame alligator, nine feet long, that he fed on terrapins and dead niggers. "Never costs me any thing to bury a dead nigger," said he. I resolved to go as far South as this place, to see if there was so much difference between the practice and theory of slavery. As I sallied forth this morning to see the place, almost the first thing that met my view was a large house, surrounded by a very high brick wall. Upon asking the first passer-by what it was, he informed me that it was a nigger jail, where the traders confined their slaves preparatory to taking them South. He very politely offered to conduct me through it, which I gladly accepted. I have heretofore supposed that the term "slavery in chains," as used in the newspapers, was a figure of speech, used comparatively. But here they were actually manacled, their feet chained together, sitting around on benches in the most filthy, loathsome place I ever saw. I questioned one as to why he was chained. He said he had been sold to go South, and he wanted to see his wife again before he went, and had run away to go back to his old master's for that purpose. My heart was too full to question any of the others.

In the female department there was a very pretty white woman with two children. By close inspection it might be seen that she had a little African blood in her veins, apparently not over one tenth, but the children did not show the least trace of it. I expressed surprise at this to my conductor, as I had supposed slavery to be confined to the African race, when I was informed that there was no limit of blood in this State. So long as the mother is a slave the offspring is also, no matter of what color. I have since learned that there are numerous slaves in this city as white as their masters.

My next move was to attend a slave auction. The slaves of all colors, from sooty black to perfect white, were brought in and seated on benches. Here they were subjected to a most particular examination. It was curious to see the manner of the speculators in examining their teeth. They would order them to open their mouth, then press back their lips with their two thumbs, just as a jockey would examine a horse. On a window-sill lay a large pile of manacles; some were constructed of a large rod of iron with handcuffs on each side, so as to form a row. The first lot sold was the white woman and her two children, that I before spoke of. The auctioneer extolled her qualities by representing her to be a first-rate seamstress, &c. She was struck down at \$1,105.

The lackey of the place (himself a slave) then leads up a man about 25. "Unharness yourself, old boy," says he. The man, trembling like a leaf all the while, strips himself, with the assistance of the lackey, in full view of the street and of the female slaves. The lackey asks him what he is shaking for, as he is not going to be hurt. The auctioneer announces no scars on his back of any consequence, and the sale proceeds: sold at \$455. Next comes a little girl of 13, about half white; then two twin brothers of about 14, sold to different masters, one, I was told, to a Southern trader; and so on to the end of the sale, when the gentlemen were thanked for their attention, and their attendance requested to-morrow, when they would be shown something nice. During the sale my attention was called to the door by a string of slaves going past, chained together, probably on their way to some Southern plantation.

Altogether, this was the most heart-sickening sight I ever saw. I involuntarily exclaimed: "Is it possible that this is permitted in my own native country—the country I have loved so well, and whose institutions I have exultingly pointed to as an example for the world?"

I am confident that the most effective way for Abolitionists to gain converts to their cause is to send Northerners as far South as this place, and let them attend one of these slave auctions. Hard, indeed, must be the heart of one who could look upon such a scene and not blush for his country's shame. I remonstrated with some of the inhabitants for permitting such a thing among them. They all have the Bible and Christianity at their tongue's end, and are ready to point out passages to justify it, and show that it is a God-ordained institution. "If this is Christianity," I replied, "don't call me a Christian."

"The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel." The truth of this Divine declaration is witnessed, not only in the treatment to which a large portion of the slaves of this country are subject, but in the ferocity

with which those are viewed who are suspected of enlightening them. A case has occurred in North-Carolina, showing the truth of this remark, and we have been furnished with the following particulars :—

Some anti-slavery pamphlets were distributed in that State in 1844. The result was, some Methodists became so much opposed to slavery, that they refused to go with the South when the M. E. Church was divided. On inquiry they learned that the Northern division was not wholly anti-slavery, but that there was a Methodist anti-slavery Church at the North. A letter of inquiry was sent to Rev. Luther Lee, of New-York, who gave the requisite information; and a Wesleyan Methodist church was organized in North-Carolina, on the principle of non-fellowship with slaveholders.

In 1847, Rev. Adam Crooks was sent to that Southern field of labor. The work increased upon his hands, and in 1848 Rev. J. C. Bacon was sent to his assistance. The work still increased, and in 1849 Rev. Jesse McBride was sent. The work continues to increase in interest and extent; and there is at the present time a membership of nearly five hundred persons, with five or six chapels, extending over portions of North-Carolina and Virginia.

The above-named ministers have been persecuted by slaveholders. Mr. Bacon has been twice indicted and put upon trial. On the charge of violating the law of Virginia by words and in the pulpit, he was acquitted; but on a charge for circulating the Narrative of Frederick Douglass, he was convicted. An appeal was taken, and the higher court reversed the decision. Mr. McBride has been indicted for giving a little pamphlet, entitled "The Ten Commandments," (applying the Decalogue to slavery,) to a white girl where he boarded; tried, convicted, and sentenced to stand in the pillory an hour, receive twenty lashes on the bare back, and be imprisoned one year. He has appealed to the Supreme Court.

Elder Edwards Matthews, an agent of the American Baptist Free Mission Society, who went to Kentucky to lecture on the moral and religious condition of the slaves, after applying in vain to three or four churches in Richmond, Madison county, for an opportunity, preached by invitation to a colored congregation; after which he was assailed by a mob, and after some personal indignities, but no serious injury, driven from the town. Proceeding to the residence of Cassius M. Clay, he prepared a statement of the outrage for publication, and left, but was pursued by some ruffians, thrown into the water several times, and, in an exhausted state, left to pursue his journey.

The infuriated slaveholders are not satisfied with inflicting barbarities upon the citizens of the free States who attempt to teach the slaves. Citizens of their own States, who express anti-slavery sentiments, are not exempt from molestation. In Alabama, Captain Elisha Betts, of Eufaula, a man advanced in years, was ordered by a company of lynchers, at a public meeting convened for the purpose, to leave the State for addressing a letter to the *National Era* on the Evils of Slavery. He was born and reared in South-Carolina, and is said to be a person of irreproachable character.

The imprisonment of Northern colored seamen, and colored seamen from other countries, at Southern ports, from the arrival until the departure of the vessels to which they belong, and the incidents growing out of it, have excited, the last year, unusual attention. About a year since the master of the bark "Mary Ann" was summoned to the Police Office, London, to show cause why he had refused to pay the

wages of Isaac Bowers, his black steward, while he was shut up in prison at Charleston, S. C. The case was afterwards brought before the notice of the House of Commons. Lord Palmerston stated as follows :—

In 1847 a note was addressed to the Government of the United States, remonstrating against the law of South-Carolina,* as not only inconsistent with the established polity of nations, but at variance with a portion of the first article of the treaty of 1815. Mr. Buchanan replied, verbally, that the Federal Government had no power to induce the Legislature of the State of South-Carolina to revoke the law; and that if the British Government insisted on its right, the Government of the United States would be obliged, reluctantly, to put an end to the treaty, upon giving twelve months' notice. Her Majesty's Government did not think any commensurate advantages would result from pressing the matter.

In January, the British Consul at Charleston, Mr. Mathew, entered into a correspondence with the Governor of South-Carolina, Mr. Means, about the law of that State which authorizes the imprisonment of free colored seamen. The Consul protested against the law, as infringing upon the rights of British seamen under the treaty. The Governor made a courteous reply, and promised to submit the communication to the Legislature. He did so, and the Legislature referred the matter to a committee, to report thereon the next session—a year hence!

The subject, so far as American seamen are concerned, was taken up in the Senate of the United States during the last session of Congress, and produced a highly excited discussion. Senator Winthrop, of Massachusetts, who had alluded to the laws of the Southern States for the imprisonment of colored seamen, while the vessels to which they belonged remained in port, was replied to by Senator Butler, of South-Carolina, who said the North did not allow the blacks to sit on juries, or be mustered in the militia, and ought not, after making such a discrimination, to complain of the South for doing the same, or preventing Northern colored seamen from tampering with the slaves. Mr. Winthrop, during his reply, read a letter from Captain Charles A. Ranlett, a shipmaster of Boston, stating that his seamen had been taken from his vessel in Southern ports, and that he had reason to believe that large numbers were imprisoned in all the ports south of Charleston, inclusive. He then remarked that he had in his possession a statement made by a person who had kept the Colored Sailor's Home in New-York some years since, by which it appeared that the number of colored seamen imprisoned in New-Orleans during a single year was 1200, in Charleston 500, in Savannah 300, and in Alabama 500. He would not, however, vouch for the correctness of the statement. Senator Berrien, of Georgia, affirmed that it was untrue. Senator Winthrop replied that it was not a question of numbers, but of principle.

A few days subsequently, Senator Winthrop introduced highly respectable testimony as to the good character of Captain Ranlett. Senator Soulé, of Louisiana, said in substance as follows :—

* This law was enacted December 19th, 1835. Judge Johnson, of the Supreme Court of South-Carolina, pronounced the act unconstitutional.

The law of Louisiana requires the harbor masters to report people of color coming on board of ships from other States to Louisiana, to the municipal authorities, who thereupon are to issue warrants for the arrest of such persons. But the law goes no farther in its severity. It only provides besides for the extradition of persons thus arrested to the State from whence they came, at their own cost, if they are able to pay; but at the cost of the State, if they are not. The law has been thus since 1842. The whole number imprisoned in New-Orleans does not exceed thirty-six in a year.

Senator Butler said he did not think the number imprisoned in Charleston was more than half that. He farther stated that no sailor had ever been sold in Charleston under the law. He continued as follows:—

I measure my words, sir, and, so far as regards the English seamen, I believe there is a willingness to modify the law to-morrow. And so far as regards even the colored men from the North, I think we would be willing to modify it.

During the debate it was stated by Senator Berrien that the State laws were constitutional, and he could show by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States that their constitutionality is undeniable and undenied by that high tribunal. If the above statements are true, how happened it that the visit of Mr. Hoar, the agent of Massachusetts, who went to Charleston to test the constitutionality of the law, made such a prodigious excitement in South-Carolina; that Mr. Hubbard, the agent to Louisiana, was ordered to depart from that city as summarily as Mr. Hoar had been ejected from Charleston; that the Legislature of South-Carolina did not at once, on the application of the British Consul, “modify” the law as it respects English seamen; and that the law has not been modified as it respects colored seamen from the North? Does the presence of a dozen or two of black sailors at each of the Southern ports during the course of a year, not in a body, but one or two at a time, produce such consternation that the authorities are obliged, in self-defense, to imprison them lest an insurrection should break out? Is the “institution” so liable to explode? The truth is, although the statements presented by Senator Winthrop may be exaggerated, the statements on the other side must have been singularly diminished.

A free colored sailor belonging to the *Majestic*, of Boston, was arrested and put in jail last August, at Wilmington, North-Carolina. The captain procured his release on paying six dollars, but the man was no sooner on board the vessel than he was again arrested, and carried back to jail, the authorities refusing to give him up, unless his *free papers* were procured. He had none, and lies in jail still, for aught we have heard.

We find in the *Tribune* of April 9th the following:—

A correspondence has taken place between Captain Porter of the steamship *Georgia* and Recorder Genois of New-Orleans, on the subject of enforcing the law of Louisiana, requiring the imprisonment of free negroes arriving on vessels entering that port, until the departure of the vessel. Captain Porter claims exemption on the ground that the *Georgia* is a national vessel, under officers of the Navy, and subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Navy. Mr. Genois, under the advice of the District Attorney, does not recognize the claim to exemption, but on account of the *Georgia* being ready for sea, consents to defer the issue of the warrants;

nevertheless, he notifies Captain Porter that upon the return of the Georgia to that port, he must execute the law.

The attorney takes high ground on the subject of State rights, and claims that the State has a right to legislate for her protection ; and if in law no exception is made regarding Government employees, they are as amenable to the law as any one else. He goes on to say :—

If Government were to employ free negroes on mail boats, might not free negroes be employed to carry mails throughout the State? Might not Government also, if the doctrine be admitted, employ vast numbers of free negroes on naval vessels, and thus flood the whole Southern country with free negroes? Whether even Government vessels have a right to land in our ports with free negroes seems to me a very doubtful question.

The arrogance of the Slave Power knows no bounds. What is there in the Constitution of the United States, that forbids the Government from employing free negroes on mail boats or naval vessels, or carrying the mails, or otherwise, as it may think proper? It has no right to make any distinction as to its employees on account of complexion. The slaveholding States forget, and the people of other States seem to forget, that slavery is a local thing, and that the Government of the United States, and the citizens of every free State, are constitutionally uncontrolled with regard to free colored citizens.

The friends of the slave have been annoyed, at several places, with suits brought by slaveholders, or at their instance, and in some cases amerced in heavy fines. A lawyer named Pratt, at Marshall, Michigan, brought six suits, says the *Cass County Advocate*, as attorney for his Kentucky plaintiffs, against seven of their citizens, five of them being members of the Society of Friends, for aiding, as was charged, slaves in obtaining their freedom.

In Indiana, a suit was brought by John Norris, of Broome county, Ky., against Leander B. Newton, E. B. Crocker, and seven others, before the Circuit Court of the United States, Mr. Justice McLean presiding, for the recovery of damages for aiding the escape of slaves. This suit was brought before the passage of the Fugitive Slave Bill, and was disposed of mainly under a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Prigg, where the Court took the ground that the owner of a slave has the right, under the Constitution, and law of 1793, to capture his slave in a free State, and take him thence, without going before a State Court and obtaining a certificate. Norris had pursued his slaves into Michigan, having taken five or six persons with him, and, in the night, captured them and proceeded homeward to Kentucky. In Indiana a party came, accompanied by a deputy sheriff, and made an arrest under a writ of *habeas corpus*. The State Judge liberated the negroes, on the ground that there was no certificate of the right of ownership having been proved in Michigan. Norris and his party, being armed with pistols and bowie-knives, and having obtained a writ from

the clerk of the Circuit Court, attempted to take the negroes. After considerable excitement they were carried to the jail for safe keeping. Criminal suits were instituted against the Kentucky party. The negroes were demanded by Norris. In the mean time a second writ of *habeas corpus* was obtained, on which, in the end, the negroes were discharged.

Judge McLean charged the jury that the decision of the Judge on the first trial was incorrect; that the writ of *habeas corpus* was at all times proper, but the question under it in that case was the right of ownership; and that the slaves should have been remanded into the custody of Norris. The Judge said he had dissented from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States when it was given, but he was now bound to carry it out. A heavy verdict was found for Norris. A considerable part of it has been collected of the friends of liberty in the free States, but the defendants are still heavy sufferers.

A suit was commenced in June last in Iowa, in the United States District Court, by one Daggs, of Missouri, against some benevolent members of the Society of Friends, for aiding, as was alleged, some slaves in obtaining their liberty. The jury gave a verdict of twenty-nine hundred dollars damages! An appeal has been taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Justice is not unfrequently done in Southern Courts, in slave cases, that should make some of our Northern magistrates ashamed of their readiness to re-enslave those who have sought an asylum in the free States. A Baltimore correspondent of the *Tribune* relates an interesting incident:—

Our County Court was engaged for several days last week in hearing a petition of a colored woman named Rebecca Garrett, and ten children, who claimed their freedom from a man named Isaac Anderson, of Howard District. The woman had been permitted to go at large for a period of *twenty years*, during which time she had married and raised a family of ten children. Her master then, seeing that she and her family were worth some three or four thousand dollars, claimed them as his property; to be disposed of as he saw proper. Several Quakers, however, took the matter in hand, and employing good counsel contested the case in a court of justice, which resulted in the Judge's charging the jury that if they believed the petitioners had been going at large for a *long period*, (without limitation,) doing acts inconsistent with slavery, with the knowledge of their owner, they were entitled to their freedom; and so the jury rendered their verdict. The case will be taken to the Court of Appeals by the owner, however. This verdict is a great triumph of justice in Maryland, as it reverses the old accepted law, that a party could let his slaves act as free persons for years, and then, through caprice or avarice, seize them and sell them into bondage. It is one bright spot on the slave-stained escutcheon of my native State, and argues a better change of feeling than I could have hoped for.

The following case has fallen under our immediate notice. A highly respectable lawyer, in Maryland, applied to the Committee for funds to carry on a suit to the higher Courts in the State against the executor of a will who, contrary to its provisions, had kept a family in slavery for several years, with the children who had been born since the death of the testator, who directed that these parents and the children living at his

decease should be free. After a long litigation success crowned the efforts of the attorney, who had devoted considerable time and money himself before he made his application, and a final decree has been obtained, setting at liberty the parties so long unjustly enslaved.

In the *Christian Mirror*, of February 20th, is an account of a suit brought by eight negroes in Virginia for their liberty, under a will, in which they were successful. Honor to whom honor is due!

Slave-breeding is carried on very extensively in Eastern Virginia, and in several other States. "By this," may many of the chivalry say, "we have our living." We know that Mr. Stevenson, when Minister to England, denied it. It was a fact too humiliating to confess there. Mr. Clay also, in his speech in the Senate, July 22d, 1850, on the Compromise Bill, peremptorily denied that slaveholders breed slaves for sale. In our last Annual Report, page 108, it was stated that Mr. Meade, member of Congress from Virginia, in a pamphlet circulated by him, had said :—

Virginia has a slave population of near half a million, whose value is chiefly dependent upon Southern demand.

Both Mr. Clay and Mr. Meade are native-born Virginians. Mr. Meade is now one of the Senators of that State in Congress. Is he not a credible witness?

The enormous profits of the cotton planters the last year have greatly increased the price of slaves, given unusual activity to the domestic slave-trade, and of course excited the expectations of the slave-breeding States. It is under such circumstances that slaveholders always become emboldened to put forth new efforts for strengthening and extending slavery, in persecuting free people of color, and denouncing emancipationists. Their influence is then paramount in Congress and over the doughfaces of the North: When cotton advances in price, emancipation at the South flags; and both Southern and Northern apologists for slavery, at such times, accuse Abolitionists of putting back the glorious cause of emancipation. When cotton falls, emancipations are more frequent, the South lessens its vituperation of Abolitionists, and it is then said that the South is doing all in its power for the liberation of the slaves. It is at such times, also, that the colonization scheme is at flood tide.

It is frequently said, not only by slaveholders, but by their friends and apologists in the free States, that slaves are contented. The numerous instances of slaves fleeing to Canada furnish proof to the contrary. But the horrors of slavery are evinced by the voluntary sufferings of fugitives rather than be returned to slavery, and by the suicides of which we hear. A young man who was a fugitive slave, after being apprehended in this State on a false charge of grand larceny with a view to prevent his re-enslavement, plead guilty, preferring to go to the State prison, though

innocent, rather than be remanded back to slavery. In the *Non-Slaveholder*, of July, 1850, we find the following, taken from a Louisville paper:—

We learn that a likely negro girl, a slave of a passenger on the steamer Lafayette, drowned herself by jumping overboard, last Wednesday morning. She was a valuable servant, and her master had been offered \$1,000 for her. She had been corrected by him for some offense or other, and she was heard to declare that he should never slap her again. When the boat was some distance above Evansville, and while the passengers were at the dinner table, she jumped into the river from the after-guard and was drowned.

Notwithstanding the cruelties inflicted upon the slaves, the measures taken by a portion of the slaveholders to extend and perpetuate the cruel system, and the attempts of the South to make itself independent of the North by building up factories, and drawing supplies directly from foreign countries, (a commendable policy so far as it may call out the natural resources and promote the industry of the South,) a strong feeling prevails among intelligent and considerate Southern men that the Union is bound together by indissoluble ties, and that the prosperity of the great divisions is reciprocal. They perceive also that the anti-slavery sentiment at the North is prevailing and increasing in strength; they acknowledge that if the enterprise is conducted on Christian principles, it will have the sympathy of increasing numbers at the South; they know that the declarations of Scripture are in harmony with natural causes to bring about emancipation at no distant day; and they will rejoice to see it hasten on.*

Such men lament, in the language of one of their papers, the “blighting influence” of slavery upon the morals, economy, and true welfare of the South; so did John Randolph, when, in 1803, he reported against the petition of Indiana for a temporary suspension of the anti-slavery clause of the Ordinance of 1787, because slave labor was demonstrably the dearest of any. Jefferson saw and acknowledged the destroying influence of slavery upon men and children in his day. Other sages at the South have at various times reiterated the same sentiments.

Indications not to be mistaken at the present time point to an increasing anti-slavery sentiment at the South. The action of the disunionists

* Hotspurs in neither the State nor the Church, at the South, are any index of the prevailing sentiment there on the slavery question. They may, for a season, prevent the truth from reaching the minds of the moderate slaveholders, and the great body of non-slaveholders, as certain would-be leaders of public sentiment have essayed to keep the churches and people of the North from a correct understanding of the anti-slavery question; but, in spite of their efforts, the people will come to a knowledge and appreciation of the subject. It has been said that the churches at the North are nearer right on the question than the ministry. It may be so at the South. The following resolution, adopted last year by the Charleston, S. C., Union Presbytery, gives, at any rate, faint hope of the ministers in that region embracing very speedily the truth on the emancipation topic:—

“Resolved, That in the opinion of this Presbytery, the holding of slaves, so far from being a sin in the sight of God, is nowhere condemned in his Holy Word.”

and perpetualists has stimulated it, though it has been momentarily repressed by their audacity and violence. Intelligent Southerners are inquiring for anti-slavery publications. They are anxious to obtain authentic information in regard to the workings of emancipation, and the proceedings of moderate and consistent Abolitionists. They believe that slavery is an evil, and that emancipation in some form would be a great blessing. Rev. W. C. Duncan, editor of the *New-Orleans Baptist Chronicle*, expresses himself in regard to slavery as follows:—

We shall rejoice to see that period arrive when slavery shall no longer be recognized in any part of the United States. Its existence at the South at the present day we honestly believe to be a check upon the prosperity, and an incubus upon the energies of the Southern people. As a civil institution, then, it is, we admit, an evil. We believe its prevalence in the South to be deleterious both in a moral and social point of view, and a barrier to the free progress of many useful institutions, and to the free dissemination of general intelligence.

Those at the South who hate the anti-slavery movements at the North cannot be cajoled by the cotton merchants and ministers in the free States to believe that abolition is subsiding. They read and judge for themselves, and despise the efforts of men who aim to secure their custom in trade, and their co-operation in literary or ecclesiastical objects, by misrepresenting facts. The following extract in proof is taken from a letter of Hon. A. Burt, M. C., of South-Carolina:—

Since the session of Congress in 1843, abolition has moved forward with fearful and unfaltering strides, and with a courage and constancy which scarce finds a parallel in history. . . . But, on my conscience, I believe the anti-slavery sentiment of the West is as deeply seated and infinitely more formidable than that of Massachusetts. . . . The result of all my observation and experience is the conviction that the North's hostility to the South is this day more ferocious, more universal, more confident of its strength, and more assured of its victim, than it ever was.

The following article appeared in the *New-Orleans Courier* of late date:—

STARTLING! ABOLITION STRENGTH IN THE CITY OF NEW-ORLEANS!—In conversing with a very intelligent citizen of the Second Municipality yesterday, and who has resided in this city for many years, upon the state of public opinion here upon the slavery question, we were altogether amazed and confounded to hear him declare his belief, that if the question of the abolition of slavery in Louisiana were submitted to the people of New-Orleans, the question would be carried by a two-third vote! Believing ourselves that so monstrous a proposal could not command a five per cent. vote out of the whole population, we mentioned the subject to several of our friends, and, though they all agreed that the opinion expressed was extravagant and excessive, we were hardly less amazed and confounded to hear them admit, as they distinctly did, that upon such an issue it was doubtful upon which side the majority of the citizens of New-Orleans would be found! We are constrained to admit that the gentlemen referred to have had greater opportunities than we have to come to a safe and sound conclusion upon such a matter; but the solace we derive from the counter opinions which have always been ours is altogether too precious and conservative of the peace and of the rights of the South, to be parted with and surrendered, but upon fuller proofs; but at the same time we must concede, that the statements made to us by persons of so much respectability and worth betoken a state of public sentiment here of the weightiest import, and of which we had not until now the smallest conception!

We were pleased to see in the *Wilmington* (Del.) *Chickens* the following:—

Slavery is a loss and a curse both to master and slave, but more particularly to poor whites residing in slave States.

The Committee are in possession of numerous facts that corroborate the above statements. They evince that while there exists an excitement at the South against anti-slavery movements, a counter state of feeling prevails among a portion of the people. We believe that this feeling is increasing. The violence of the Perpetualists, their encroachments on the free States, their wrath and enmity towards the free people of color, and their threats of disunion in order to induce the North to succumb, disgust no inconsiderable portion of Southerners themselves. Were they to speak out their sentiments, a tale would be heard that would astonish the timid and time-serving at the South, and confound Northern apologists of slaveholders.

We are well aware that Northerners of various professions, who visit the South on business or pleasure, often speak, after their return, of the happy condition of the slaves, the kindness of the masters, the injurious effects of anti-slavery agitation in the free States, and the determination of the South to dissolve the Union unless Northern fanatics will let them alone. But such persons see only the surface of things at the South. There are those who, when in the slave States, commune with people of another class, look deeper into the question, and find a strong feeling existing in many minds who regard with anguish the state of society in which they are forced to live, and the prospects before them. Thousands at the South take a deep interest in the agitation of the subject of slavery, wish God-speed to every judicious effort at the North for the benefit of the people of color, and look forward with devout anticipation to the day when slavery shall come to a peaceful termination.

The whole number of slaveholders in the United States does not exceed, it is said, one hundred and thirteen thousand;* so that a great majority of the white adults of the South are non-slaveholders. The slavocracy

* Taking the actual number in Kentucky for the basis of the calculation. But to this number should be added a few hundreds of Northern slaveholders. Probably in every free State there are some who own slaves at the South. We do not include Southern slaveholders who reside at the North, of whom there are a few, but native-born citizens of the free States who own slave plantations. How many there are of these miscreants we have no means of computing. A writer in the *Christian Mirror*, printed at Portland, says, "We have those in Maine who are large owners of slaves at the South, whose slaves are under task-masters." There are members of churches in the city of New-York and vicinity, and doubtless in other places at the North, who own slaves at the South. Northern merchants have owned plantations and slaves in Cuba and elsewhere, and probably do still. And numerous are the instances in which Northern merchants, members of churches as well as others, by their attorneys or other agents, seize slaves on execution for debt, and either cause them to be bound out or sold, so that they may pocket the proceeds. Our Northern preachers and politicians, who say, What have we to do with slavery here? may, in the above facts, find an answer to their question.

rules them with a rod of iron, as it has ruled the North almost from the foundation of the government. But some even of the slaveholders are tired of the system, and concur with the friends of emancipation, both in the slave and free States, respecting the evils of slavery and the blessings of freedom.

A Constitutional Convention has recently been in session in Virginia, and it has been occupied in discussing the question of the basis of representation. Western Virginia has been considered as leaning to anti-slavery, and Eastern Virginia as one of the most pro-slavery portions of the Union. Western Virginia has 495,000 white population and only 63,000 slaves, while the East has 401,000 whites and 413,000 slaves.

A contest has been carried on between these sections of the Old Dominion for many years. That part of the State east of the Blue Ridge, with about four ninths of the free population, pays nearly two thirds of the taxes. They desire that one half of the representatives should be apportioned in the ratio of the voters, and the other half in that of taxation, which would give the preponderance to the eastern section. The West demand that the representation should be in the ratio of the voters, which would give the supremacy to them. The old Constitution of the State limited the franchise to freeholders owning twenty-five acres of improved, or a hundred of unimproved land, or a house and lot in town. This was afterwards altered by making the owner of fifty acres of unimproved land a voter. The Legislature was apportioned so as to give the East nineteen Senators and the West only thirteen; to the East seventy-eight members of the House, and to the West fifty-six. It is mainly in consequence of this inequality that the Convention was called. In Western Virginia the proportion between the white and slave-population is diminishing, and free labor is deemed respectable. In point of general intelligence and freedom of thought, the western part of the State is superior to the other, and it cannot be that that portion of the State will long consent to be ruled by the aristocracy of Eastern Virginia.*

The following statement, made by a Baltimore correspondent of the *Tribune*, illustrates, says a writer, an influence at work in the middle slave States, more potential than abolition lectures or incendiary pamphleteering, to effect the rapid extinction of slavery within their borders. Slaveholders cannot afford to hold property long which has to be insured at such premiums :—

The papers from Western Virginia, Western Maryland, and the Eastern Shore counties, teem with advertisements of rewards for runaway slaves. The difficulty of re-capturing runaways has increased the amount generally offered very much, \$300 and \$350 each being very common. I am informed by a slave-catcher and dealer that the loss of slave property this spring and summer from Maryland and

* Since the above was written we learn that the Basis Question will probably be settled by a compromise!—by which the lower house of the State Legislature will have in it a Western majority of 14, while the upper house will have an Eastern majority of 10. This will give the western part of the State a majority of 4 on joint ballot.

Virginia is larger than at any former period. He showed me a list of advertisements he had arranged in his note book for references, offering rewards for eighty-one, amounting to about \$12,000. The total value of this number would be fully \$50,000. A snug item for slave owners to post to "profit and loss account"—a great majority of them never being recovered.

The population statistics of the United States furnish still stronger evidence that slavery must cease, in consequence of natural causes, in several States that are now resisting the discussion of principles that lead to voluntary emancipation, and abusing those who advocate them. The following table shows the population of the two sections of the Union in 1850, compared with that of 1840:—

FREE STATES.									
Free population in 1850,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18,574,797
Do. do. 1840,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,728,972
Increase,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,845,825
Rate of increase, 39½ per cent.									
SLAVE STATES									
Free population in 1850,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6,409,938
Do. do. 1840,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,848,150
Increase,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,561,788
Rate of increase, 32¾ per cent.									
Slave population in 1850,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,075,234
Do. do. 1840,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,486,231
Increase,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	589,003
Rate of increase, 23.6 per cent.									

The *Southern Press*, the pro-slavery paper established the last year at Washington, as the organ of the slaveholders, speculates upon these general results as demonstrating that the aggregate of white and black population in the South will equal that of the North in half a century, and that in a century the white population alone of the South will equal the total population of the North, even if foreign immigration were now to cease. Dr. Bailey, the talented editor of the *National Era*, has shown that the whole argument is founded on very improbable assumptions. He shows that the natural increase of the non-slaveholding States is 26 per cent., and that of the slaveholding 24 per cent. Chickering, in his elaborate work published in 1848, estimated the natural increase of the white population of the United States at 26.28 per cent. for ten years. The estimate of the *Era* for the free population is about 25 per cent., so that the natural increase of the North is one per cent. more than the average, that of the South one per cent. less.

His calculations on this point, founded on the censuses of 1830 and 1840, make the difference much greater:—

The actual increase of the *white* population of the United States, from 1830 to 1840, was, as just stated, 3,658,428, or 34.71 *per cent.*; of free States, 2,686,546, or 39.06 *per cent.*, and of slave States, 971,882, or 26.54 *per cent.*, being greater than the *natural* increase, averaging through the United States, by 8.43, 12.78 and 26. *per cent.* respectively, and showing a great difference between the two sections of the country. This difference has arisen partly from the *greater foreign immigra-*

tion into the free States, as will appear on reference to table I, the amount there being as 4 to 1, and the proportion as 2 to 1 nearly in favor of the free States.

The whole number of foreign immigrants registered at the custom-houses of the United States, in 10 years from July 1, 1830, to June 30, 1840,		
was	- - - - -	579,870
Add 50 per cent. on account of omissions,	- - - - -	289,685
Natural increase of foreign immigrants,	- - - - -	19,650
Total,	- - - - -	888,705

Of whom the number of immigrants that entered the country was—

	Free States.	Slave States.
	460,030	119,340
Add 50 per cent.,	230,015	59,670
Proportion of their natural increase,	15,602	4,048
Total,	705,647	183,058

After deducting 705,647 from 2,686,546, the whole increase of the whites in the free States, we have remaining 1,980,899, which is 28.806303, &c., per cent. of 6,876,620, the number of the whites in 1830. This is a rate of increase of 2.52 per cent. more than the average of the whole country.

After deducting 183,058 from 971,882, the whole increase of the whites in the slave States, we have 788,824 for the amount of their natural increase, which is 21.548105, &c., per cent. of 3,660,758, their number in 1830, or 4.74 per cent. less than the average in the whole country, and 7.26 per cent. less than in the free States. Besides, it is confidently believed that more white persons emigrate from the free to the slave States, than from the slave to the free States.

The *Era* thinks the difference between the ratios of natural increase estimated too high; but, after the various calculations that have been presented, it presumes no candid mind can doubt that there is a decided difference in favor of the free States. That it is not greater is owing to the fact, that the vast new territory acquired by slavery for the last half century has delayed to a great extent its depressing influence on population. It is in the older States, whose soil has been exhausted by its improvident culture, that we are to look for its effects upon the ratio of natural increase.

The Committee have, in answer to applications from slave States, furnished publications,* and contributed aid for their diffusion, and they are in regular correspondence with Southern gentlemen animated with the same feelings as themselves. Mr. Jefferson, in his letter to Dr. Price† of England, said:—

I am satisfied, if you could resolve to address an exhortation to those young men, [in William and Mary College, Virginia,] with all that eloquence of which you are master, that its influence on the future decision of this important question [slavery] would be great, perhaps decisive.

A weekly newspaper, entitled *Progress of the Age*, under the auspices of CASSIUS M. CLAY, has recently been issued at Lexington, Ky., "devoted to universal Freedom, Education, and Improvement." It is an

* The Society during the past year have issued several publications, some of which have had a wide circulation. Large editions of the *Liberty Almanac* were published. It is intended to continue it from year to year, and it is suggested to the friends of the cause that there is scarcely any way in which they can better promote it than by sending their orders for this anti-slavery manual and giving it a wide circulation.

† Jefferson's Letters, Vol. I, p. 268.

emancipation paper, and urges the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Bill, and "the emancipation upon the soil, after a fixed day, of all persons born in the State." Mr. Clay is visiting different parts of Kentucky and zealously advocating the cause of freedom, according to his peculiar views. His eloquence, in conjunction with the new paper, and other anti-slavery agencies in that State, will, it is thought, awaken the attention of the people more than at any former period.

The *Free Presbyterian* newspaper, at Mercer, Pa., has superseded the *Mercer Luminary*, and is conducted with new zeal and ability. Many other anti-slavery newspapers continue, with increased vigor and success, to advocate the cause. A paper in the German language has recently been started in the city of New-York, entitled the *Working Man's Gazette*. Several papers, of large circulation, some of which once opposed the anti-slavery cause, now insert a great deal of anti-slavery intelligence and argument, and exert a most beneficial influence.

Were anti-slavery men at the North united in judiciously promulgating and diffusing the great principles for the dissemination of which they originally associated themselves together, they could by the blessing of Heaven greatly increase and strengthen the anti-slavery sentiment of the country; make it almost impossible to organize opposition at the North, and even do much to render it odious at the South. This want of unity we greatly lament, but we see not how it can be prevented while so many questions of reform are intermixed with the great anti-slavery enterprise. To be successful in the great work of delivering this nation from the sin of slavery, those engaged in it must unite discretion with zeal, and be governed in all they say and do by the principles and precepts of Christianity.

Influential men, who early took a decided stand against the anti-slavery enterprise, have attempted to justify their continued opposition by alleging what they are pleased to call the fanatical and infidel views of some of the early Abolitionists, and avowed by some of their disciples. As if fanaticism or even infidelity, on the part of individuals belonging to a great reformatory association, could excuse any in their refusal to co-operate with a body of men who aim, by peaceable, moral and constitutional measures, to deliver the country from its greatest curse. We have no sympathy with those, be they Abolitionists or pro-slavery men, be they residents of the North or of the South, who malign the Church or ministry, or who advocate the destruction of the Constitution or the overthrow of the government. True abolitionism has no affinity with infidelity or anarchy, and is not justly chargeable with the errors on other subjects, of any who embrace its doctrines. It would be more reasonable to refer the origin of such errors, among professed Abolitionists, so far as they exist, to the conduct of those who, while professing to be Christians and patriots, have stood aloof from a righteous

cause that claims the warm and continued support of every friend of God and man. Theologians without humanity, politicians without honesty, and professing Christians with hearts of adamant on the subject of caste and slavery, may take to themselves a large share of the sin of increasing infidelity and misrule in this country for the last twenty years. That many have been driven into skepticism by the opposition of ministers of the gospel and church-members to the anti-slavery cause, is a fact not more true than sad. And it ought to be a matter of serious reflection, among such persons, that in opposing the principles of the anti-slavery cause they have been fighting against God.

On behalf of this Society we claim that the original principles of association have been cherished and acted out by it, with scrupulous fidelity; and so long as it shall exist we trust that all its members will be able conscientiously to say that as "we owe it to the oppressed, to oppressors, to our country, to the world, and to God, to do all that is right and lawfully in our power to bring about the extinction of slavery and the slave-trade," we will, "with a prayerful reliance on Divine aid," adhere to the principles of the original association, maintain its Declaration of Sentiments, and aid to prosecute the work in a manner to commend it to the consciences and hearts of every true friend to his country and to the religion of Christ.

The manifest improvement, from year to year, of the people of color, is most gratifying to their friends. Just in proportion to their advancement in industrial pursuits and moral character, will the day hasten that shall witness the abolition of caste and slavery. The time is rapidly approaching, when facts similar to those we now place on record will be deemed supremely ridiculous. St. Thomas Protestant Episcopal church, in Philadelphia, is composed of some of the most respectable colored people of that city. The Episcopal Convention of the Diocese of Pennsylvania have, for years, had a regulation, which prohibited this church, which has been under the superintendence of the Bishop for more than fifty-five years, from being represented by delegates. During the past year, the Minister, Wardens, and Vestrymen, petitioned the Convention to repeal the regulation. The matter was referred to a committee, a majority of whom not only reported adversely to the prayer of the petitioners, but affirmed that the *color, physical and social condition*, and education of the petitioners rendered them entirely unfit to sit in deliberative bodies!

The Church of St. Philip, in New-York, is not allowed to be represented by its delegate in the Episcopal Convention of that State.

The "National Division of the Sons of Temperance,"* in convention at Boston last year, by a vote of 74 yeas to 6 nays, decided, that "the admis-

* This is the chief and controlling body, and it includes all the Divisions throughout the United States and British Provinces.

sion of negroes into the Order is improper and illegal." They advised that the "blacks" have distinct and separate organizations, as it is the "proper course, as well for the blacks as the whites." Among those who voted for this arbitrary and disgraceful resolution, we see the names of a few who have ranked themselves as Abolitionists, and of some others who profess to be anti-slavery in their views and feelings; but we are assured that the proceeding was hasty, and they deeply regret it. It is said, that a majority of those who are numbered among the yeas are ashamed of the measure, but instead of having the act erased from their journal, think that it is best to consider it null and void, and so allow it to pass into oblivion. We hope they will summon sufficient manhood publicly to reconsider the shameful deed.* The *New-York Evangelist*, remarking upon this disgraceful act, says:—

We hope the Order will be shamed out of its pitiable prejudice, and preserve the manly stand it has once taken on this subject. Most people will think that such delicate fastidiousness of taste hardly becomes an Order originally composed of reformed drunkards. Many of them, noble combatants though they be, are quite too recently from the gutters to make a sneer at colored people look well on their faces. If their reform is but skin-deep, they ought to begin anew; and we are confident that many of the Sons will not be contented with such a shallow species.

We perceive, in the *New-York Tribune* of September 7th, an account of a light colored woman being repelled by the conductor of a Harlem railroad car, and have read with high gratification the noble remarks of the editor of that paper with reference to the outrage. A Justice of the Peace, in Ohio, being offended that a colored child should attend the same school with his own children, sent a written order to the trustees to turn the boy out. When told that he must go, he cried, "My God! will they turn me out of school; will they force me into ignorance?"

Although such treatment of respectable colored persons is not unfrequent in various parts of the country, yet it is acknowledged on all sides that every year bears witness to the increased kindness of the white to the colored population. Some months since, a petition, signed by twenty-five persons of color, was presented to the Constitutional Convention of Ohio, praying for equal political privileges. A Mr. Roll objected to its reception, and demanded the yeas and nays, which resulted in a vote of 76 to 26 in favor of its reception.† The Michigan State Convention have adopted a clause, enfranchising Indians and their descendants, and de-

* The Worthy Chaplains of the National Division are, Rev. Messrs. Stone, of Boston, and Beecher, of Brooklyn, N. Y. They, of course, must feel grieved at such an act, and desire its formal repeal.

† We have received from an eminent citizen of Ohio a letter, of which the following is an extract: "No written report was made by the Committee, I think. If the Convention had intended the right of suffrage to the colored people, it would have defeated the Constitution. The prejudice against it is, however, giving way, and will continue to give way as the dark colored race continue to improve. I should have voted for giving them equal privileges in this and in all other things, for *I can select from the white population more men who are incapable, than I can of blacks in this State.*"

cided to submit to the people the question of extending the privileges of citizenship to the African race.*

It will be in vain that the friends of the colored race labor by precept and example to abolish unjust distinctions in society, unless they seek to elevate themselves, and show by their industry, frugality, temperance and moral deportment, that they are worthy of any position which their white fellow-citizens enjoy. The intelligent of their number have long seen, and are inculcating this truth among the masses, while they are themselves setting a praiseworthy example of intellectual and moral elevation. An American League of colored seamen was formed in New-York last year for mutual benefit, which we hope will be productive of much good. The colored population of the city of Detroit, in 1850, was 1,000. They owned upwards of \$30,000 of real estate, a nearly equal amount of personal property, and upwards of 160 houses on leased lots. There are not more than a hundred, over ten years of age, who cannot read and write.

In the recent Convention of citizens of color, held in the city of New-York, Mr. John Jay Zuille presented highly interesting statistics respecting the education of children. It appears that the educational interests of the colored children are committed to the care of the Public-School Society, the Society for the Promotion of Education among Colored Children, and the Board of Education, and such other institutions as may give free education to children, including the Asylum for Colored Orphans. The whole number of children in school last year was 3,398, being one eighth of the whole colored population of the city. "The schools are open to all—free as the air we breathe."

We find in the *Tribune* of April 16th the following:—

There is now open in Philadelphia, an exhibition of the colored mechanics, on the plan of the Franklin Institute, and for the first effort exceeds the most sanguine expectations of all. On visiting the place I was much surprised to see the beautiful specimens of work exhibited there, which would be a credit to any mechanic. The portrait paintings of Vidal of your city, and Wilson of this, are very creditable. The marine paintings by Bowser are excellent. Dutere, an undertaker, has some fine work in his line. Dr. Rock has some of the most splendid specimens of artificial teeth that we ever beheld, and his recommendations as to character and science we have never seen equalled. There is an invention by Roberts for replacing cars on the track when thrown off, which is quite ingenious. There are many creditable things, such as sofas, spring bedsteads, fancy tables, bonnets, embroidery, stoves, stereotype plates, stone ware, saddles, &c. For the whole, we think that the exhibition reflects credit on the colored people.

In the *Tribune*, of March 4th, is an account of a concert by colored people, interspersed with an address and recitations, "of an order not excelled very recently by any class of the community."

In the *National Era*, of April 24th, is an able article, by the editor,

* In the *Friend of India* is an article, intended to display the evils of caste, and headed, "The Days of Caste Numbered." It has been among the greatest obstacles to the introduction of the gospel, and the fruits of the labors of this Society are beginning to appear in efforts made by American missionaries to abolish caste among persons converted to Christianity by their instrumentality.

on the colored population of the United States, speaking of the progress among the *free* people of color, and proving that the present generation of slaves is much superior to the preceding, as that was to the immediate descendants of the imported Africans. Among the free people of color, the number of property-holders has greatly multiplied. They have more schools, more churches, more benevolent associations, and this in spite of the fact, that never had any people to struggle against such obstacles. The editor argues strongly in favor of the diffusion of intelligence among the masses, and the removal of disabilities which impair their self-respect and weaken their energies, and says: "As they cannot and ought not to be thrust out of our borders, we should attach them to the country by dealing justly with them, and seeking their improvement. 'Here, as in all other cases, justice is wisdom; oppression a blunder, as well as crime.'"

The Constitutions of the free States invariably treat colored people as citizens.* In five of the New-England States they are entitled to vote.† In several States their children mix in the same schools on equal terms with white children. Educated colored men are found in the professions of law, medicine and theology. It is idle to say, that, with the same advantages, the people of color cannot equal the whites in literary, mechanical, and agricultural pursuits, and that they will not make as useful and well-behaved members of the community. Away, then, with the absurd notions of caste, and the prejudices against color, of which semi-civilized nations, and even heathen, are becoming utterly ashamed.

During the last year the Committee sent an agent to NEW-MEXICO to inquire into the state of things, see what could be done to advance the anti-slavery cause, and co-operate with the friends of Freedom in that territory. He is still there, and has communicated valuable information, while he is prosecuting his agency with discretion and ability. It was made part of his duty to circulate an address in English and Spanish, showing the unprofitableness of slave labor, and such other publications as would be useful to the mixed population of that incipient State.

It was the earnest desire of many of the principal inhabitants of New-Mexico that slavery should be prohibited for ever by Congress. One of them, Hugh N. Smith, Esq., who was elected a delegate to that body, strongly recommended the interdiction of slavery, and it is supposed he was refused a seat on that account. Congress, instead of extending the Ordinance of 1787 over the new Territory, left it to the people to decide, when the time shall arrive for the formation of a State government, whether slavery shall be established or not. Nothing contributed more powerfully to this result than the declaration of Mr. Webster in the Senate, that "the law of nature—the law of physical geography—the law of the

* The law of Virginia, of December 3d, 1792, recognizes people of color as citizens. The original law, passed in 1779, contained a distinction of color, but the words "white persons," were stricken out in 1792.

† Connecticut is the exception.

foundation of the earth," excluded slavery from the new Territories.* This declaration was made in the face of notorious facts to the contrary. While the Northern Senator was using his influence against the prohibition of slavery, a Southern Senator frankly avowed the truth. Senator Davis, of Mississippi, acknowledged that the valley of the Gila is rich in gold, and that *slaves will probably be taken there if not prohibited by Congress.*

Energetic efforts are being made to introduce slavery into New-Mexico. The fears and jealousies of the Mexican part of the population are aroused by the assurance of those in favor of the measure that if negro slavery is excluded their system of peonage† will be prohibited; and persons from slave States are moving into the Territory, with their domestic "servants," to familiarize the people to slave labor. It behooves all the friends of freedom in the free States, in their correspondence, by encouragement of the emigration of friends of freedom, and other measures, to strengthen the hands of the opponents of slavery in the new Territory. The eyes of the people of the free States should be fixed on New-Mexico with ceaseless vigilance, lest the enemy take advantage of their supineness and plant slavery in that extensive country so firmly that it will not soon be eradicated. Politicians pretend that the "laws of nature" prevent the introduction of slavery into the Territories of New-Mexico and Utah, but the cupidity and despotism of man triumphs over these laws. From evidence in our possession we know that plans are laid and schemes are on foot for the establishment of slavery in New-Mexico, and that unless the voice of the people of the free States is loud and determined against its extension, it will find a foothold there in spite of the predictions of Mr. Webster and all who take his opinions or the opinions of any aspiring politician for facts.‡

In UTAH attempts will be made, also, to introduce slavery. The *Frontier Guardian*, a Mormon paper, says:—

We feel it to be our duty to define our position in relation to the subject of slavery. There are several men in the valley of the Salt Lake from the Southern States, who have their slaves with them. There is no law in Utah to authorize slavery, neither any to prohibit it. If the slave is disposed to leave his master, no power exists here, either legal or moral, that will prevent him. But if the slave chooses to remain with his master, none are allowed to interfere between the mas-

* It is impossible to restrain indignation at the conduct of Mr. Webster, or to refrain from charging upon him more than upon any other person the triumphs achieved by the Slave Power. There was a juncture when he might by his personal influence have arrested the iniquitous measures for giving slavery a chance of extension over the new Territories, checked the arrogance of the slaveholders in Congress, and given a mighty impetus to the anti-slavery cause. Instead of this—at the exigency, when the eyes of the nation were upon him, and in full recollection of his former declarations on the side of freedom—he astonished the nation by giving in his adherence to the Slave Power!

† This is a species of slavery resulting from debt, and is bottomed upon contract.

‡ Mr. Webster, in a speech delivered at Buffalo, since the above was written, said: "Those who have types at command, have a perfect right to express their opinions; but I doubt their right to express opinions as facts." So, then, none but politicians have a right to express opinions as facts!

ter and the slave. All the slaves that are here appear to be perfectly contented and satisfied. When a man in the Southern States embraces our faith, and is the owner of slaves, the Church says to him: If your slaves wish to remain with you, and to go with you, put them not away; but if they choose to leave you, or are not satisfied to remain with you, it is for you to sell them, or to let them go free, as your own conscience may direct you. The Church on this point assumes not the responsibility to direct. The laws of the land recognize slavery; we do not wish to oppose the laws of the country. If there is sin in selling a slave, let the individual who sells him bear that sin, and not the Church. Wisdom and prudence dictate to us this position, and we trust that our position will henceforth be understood."

We trust that the inhabitants of this Territory, and the emigrants to it, will emulate the conduct of the people of California, and not have occasion to rue the day when they allowed slavery, under any circumstances, to obtain a foot-hold in that region, destined, with free labor, to be an important and flourishing State in the Union.

CALIFORNIA took a noble stand for Freedom. Slavery might have succeeded there better than in New-Mexico or Utah, but the people, many of them emigrants from slave States, knew that its introduction, though it might result in temporary profit, would blast the brilliant prospects of the new State, and therefore unanimously forbade it. The stand taken at the North, which induced slaveholders to believe that the Ordinance of 1787 would be extended over all the new Territories, contributed to this result. The attempt to prohibit free people of color from inhabiting California failed in the Convention for forming the Constitution by a large majority; and the clause prohibiting slavery passed by the vote of every member. The Bill for the admission of California into the Union, with the Constitution she had framed, and the boundaries she had defined, after strong opposition passed the Senate, 34 yeas to 16 nays, the House, 150 yeas to 57 nays, and was signed by the President September 10th, 1850.

Experiments are being made in Jamaica in raising cotton. A field of ten acres was planted, and produced 630 lbs. to the acre. The average crop in our Southern States is 300 lbs. Mr. Blagrove has planted thirty acres. He is a resident proprietor, with means, and his example, says the *Kingston Morning Journal*, will be followed. This plant, as is well known, grows spontaneously in Africa, and we have heard that a cargo of cotton was shipped not long ago from Africa to England.*

The manufacture of flax-cotton has been successfully tested both at Glasgow and Manchester, and the attention of the commercial as well as the philanthropic world is now anxiously directed to this subject. The prospect is, that the use of flax with cotton will materially lessen the consumption of the latter, and of course render slaves and slave labor less valuable. Should the anticipations of the parties concerned be realized, the emancipation of the slaves will be hastened. The Chevalier Claussen

* Our esteemed fellow-countrymen, Messrs. Pennington and Garnett, are now in Great Britain, lecturing for the Free Produce Associations of that country. This is a subject that interests considerable numbers of persons in this country also.

has visited Manchester to make trial of his patent process for spinning flax-cotton. The experiments were said to be highly satisfactory. One of our newspapers states :—

Their complete success would produce a tremendous change in the commerce of the world. Flax is raised in Russia, Great Britain, Flanders, Holland, Egypt, New-Zealand, and Australia, and in all the free States of the Union, who have it in their power, if the new experiment succeeds agreeably to present expectation, to strike a blow at slavery that must result in its overthrow. The best soil in the world for the production of flax is that of the middle and western part of this continent. Over ten hundred thousand cwt. are annually used in Great Britain now, in the manufacture of linen, and the various mixtures of linen and wool; but if the flax fibre could be furnished, as Claussen states, at four pence sterling per pound, and spun by cotton and woollen machines, the consumption of it would be prodigiously extended. It would supplant cotton in many of its most common uses, and in that way work a great revolution.

Mr. Elijah Slack, of Renfrew, Scotland, has invented a machine by which the coarsest hemp, old bagging, jute, &c., are converted into the finest flax and flax-cotton. It is said that his invention has priority to that of Claussen. According to the *Glasgow Saturday Post*, the invention, when fully developed, is calculated to effect a surprising revolution in spinning and weaving manufactures. It is understood from practical parties that the experiments thus far are most satisfactory and conclusive. Our own countrymen do not intend to be outdone in this new enterprise. The editor of the *Louisville Journal* states that he has received from Dr. O. S. Leavitt a beautiful specimen of flax-cotton produced from the common coarse flax, such as is grown in Kentucky for seed. Dr. Leavitt states that it can be produced from unrotted flax, as cheap as cotton, and will run to fine numbers. He has been for several years engaged in making experiments on hemp, and boasts of being in possession of important knowledge on the subject, which is not known to Claussen. We join with tens of thousands in saying, "Speed the Flax-cotton Loom!"

During the visit of our countrymen and friends, Messrs. Pennington and Garnett,* to Germany, the past year, meetings were held on the subject of slavery, and a GERMAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY was formed at Frankfort. In 1848 a few individuals in that ancient town, desirous of co-operating in the suppression of slavery, projected an association having this for its object; but owing to political troubles, the matter was postponed. The assembling of the Peace Congress there rekindled their zeal. Mr. Heyden, the first Civic Magistrate of Frankfort, a gentleman well known for his philanthropy, and Dr. Carové, of Heidelberg, a cor-

* These gentlemen are now in Great Britain, laboring zealously and efficiently to promote the anti-slavery cause. Mr. Garnett is lecturing in behalf of an association in England on Free Produce. Dr. Pennington has lectured on that and other subjects. Within a few days we have seen his deed of emancipation. He escaped from slavery twenty years since. Whether living or dead, his former master and his heirs did not know. The administrator was therefore glad to receive \$150 for his emancipation; a cheap price for liberating an American Doctor of Divinity from slavery!

responding member of this Committee, and author of the eloquent address to his countrymen in the United States, published a few years since by our Society, were conspicuous on the occasion. Rev. Louis Bonnet, pastor of the French Protestant Association, was elected President, and Mr. Charles Bourignon, Secretary. A Committee was also formed to promote as far as possible the disuse of produce cultivated by slave labor.

Our brethren of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society have pursued their arduous labors with untiring industry. Their excellent periodical, the *Reporter*, furnishes ample evidence that their watchfulness over the whole anti-slavery field is unceasing and vigilant, that they exert a beneficial influence on their Government, and, in various important respects, uphold the anti-slavery cause throughout the world. Two of their number, Messrs. John Candler and G. W. Alexander, of England, visited this city on their return from an excursion to the West India colonies, to observe the workings of emancipation, and to ascertain the present condition of the people. An interesting account of their journey has been published in the *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter*. The following remarks are taken from it.

ENGLISH COLONIES.

Of BARBADOES they say: "We think, on the whole, that the physical condition of the Barbadian peasantry, though far from being prosperous, presents an immense gain as compared with the days of slavery, and is calculated to afford satisfaction to the friends of freedom." Of St. VINCENT they remark: "The laborers are said to be *never idle*. They are exemplary in their attendance on public worship, and so far as we are able to judge, their moral condition is more satisfactory than in any other British colony." Respecting ANTIGUA,* it is said: "We expected, morally speaking, more of Antigua than of the other colonies, and found a greater advance in this respect than in most of them. . . . The people have proved themselves good subjects, and they continue to exhibit the pleasing spectacle of an improved and improving community." St. KIRTS is suffering on account of lowness of wages, and the unwillingness of planters to sell small portions of ground; and "the moral state of the laborers is, we fear, but little better than their physical and social condition. Of JAMAICA it is said: "One half, at least, of the coffee now exported from Jamaica is said to be raised by the common people. . . . Our progress through the country tended to convince us, that although much depres-

* Mr. Alexander stated that at a dinner at which he was present, a colored man sat opposite the Governor who is a puisne judge and has the title of "Honorable;" also that many born slaves have risen to high stations from the force of talent alone. And we learn from the report of the Governor of Antigua, that a vast majority of the offenses committed are of a light character; that he knows of no peasantry whose condition of life is on the whole superior to that enjoyed by those around him.

sion existed, and all classes shared in the suffering, the distress was far from being so deep and general as we had been led to expect. The planters justly attribute their losses and difficulties chiefly to the operation of our late imperial Sugar Act. We find the free laborers of the British West Indies in a state of comfort that might compare favorably with the working classes of our own country. . . . It is also no small proof of industry that the peasantry have been able to buy tens of thousands of freeholds.”*

We regret that Messrs. Alexander and Candler did not procure and publish the testimony of some hundreds of intelligent persons, in different professions and conditions in life, at the various islands, as to the workings of emancipation in an industrial, educational, and moral point of view; the reasons why the condition of the inhabitants in these respects is not as favorable as was anticipated; and the opinions now held by influential persons in these lands, as to the great benefits that have resulted, notwithstanding adverse circumstances, from the liberation of the black and colored population. Such testimony, accompanied by statements of facts, published in a small pamphlet, and widely circulated, would be of very great service. It would cheer the friends of the negro in their efforts to bring about universal emancipation, and have a tendency to shut the mouths of the enemies of the anti-slavery cause, who continually point to what they consider the injurious results of emancipation in the West Indies, as evidence that freedom has been a curse rather than a blessing to the islands. We hope such testimony will be collected, and given to the world.

It is, we think, deeply to be regretted, that the philanthropic people of Great Britain did not, at an early day, send to the colonies well qualified persons, to introduce improvements in agriculture and the mechanical arts, and aid the emancipated in commencing the new life opened to them by the noble and munificent acts of their Government. What an immense advantage, for example, would the agricultural implements and skill of an English farmer be to the tillers of the soil in Jamaica! What benefit might they have derived from the example, instruction, and assistance of a few practical men sent out to teach them the best modes of securing sufficient quantities of land, cultivating it advantageously, disposing of the produce to the best advantage, &c. The emancipated needed advice and assistance from those who had their welfare at heart, and who had the ability and means to aid them in their industrial pursuits. It is not too

* We have received letters from Mr. Thomas Jones, Secretary of the Barbadoes Anti-Slavery Society, of recent date, giving valuable intelligence respecting the island, and stating explicitly that “emancipation is not a failure in the British West Indies, and especially in this island, but rather a boon of incalculable worth, as well to the planter as to the laborer.” Mr. Jones also furnishes copies of resolutions passed by the Committee of the Society, and at a public meeting, with reference to the Fugitive Slave Act, which seems to have filled the inhabitants of the island, as might naturally be expected, with astonishment.

The *Journal of Commerce* of May, 1850, gives a favorable account of the exportation of produce from Bermuda.

late to commence this labor of love for the thousands who have their liberty, but not the knowledge to use it to the best advantage. The soil is unsurpassed in fertility, but much of it lies waste; and the portion that is cultivated yields but a comparatively scanty supply, owing to the miserable mode by which the negroes have been taught to cultivate it. One English farmer at Jamaica, with suitable means, stock, and implements, on a farm of three hundred acres, with laborers who should be paid adequate wages, might, at the present time, be of unspeakable service to the whole island. His success would attract other farmers, stimulate the well-directed industry of the laboring classes, and hold out inducements for colored laborers in this country to go to Jamaica. We respectfully commend this subject to the attention of British philanthropists, now that appeals are made to the colored people of this country to emigrate to Jamaica.

THE FRENCH COLONIES.

At MARTINIQUE "the Mayor" expressed his great satisfaction at the good conduct of the people, and his astonishment and delight at the result of emancipation: "*C'est magnifique ; c'est superbe !*" At GUADALOUPE "a good system of secular education prevails in the large towns, to which the poor of all classes and of every color resort. . . . White, brown and black children sit together on the same forms without distinction, and have the benefit of able teachers."* At DOMINICA the travellers learned that "the laboring population is quite equal to the wants of the colony." . . . In the northeast of the island, where the principal sugar estates are situated, the common people are said to make a good living, and to lay by money.†

THE DANISH COLONIES.

SANTA CRUZ is not yet fully the abode of liberty, but we trust that it soon will be. The proclamation of freedom to the slave population, dated 3d July, 1848, which bestowed unconditional freedom on the slave, has since been repealed. . . . We are confident that their condition (that of the peasantry) is greatly improved since a partial emancipation has been conferred upon them.

Respecting St. THOMAS it is said, that

The slaves who lived in the town were made unconditionally free; but the slaves

* M. Perrinon, Member of the French Assembly from Guadeloupe, said, in a speech replete with facts, that the negro population had greatly improved in morality since emancipation, and that marriages had increased in a most remarkable manner.

† It will be remembered that the Provisional Government of France decreed the complete abolition of slavery in the French West Indies; and also, that after the expiration of two years, any Frenchman, persisting in holding slaves in any part of the world, should be denationalized. Not long since a proposition was introduced into the National Assembly, to extend the operation of the last provision to ten years, and it passed, we are sorry to say, by a large vote—the Republicans voting against the extension.

who live on the estates in the country, 2,000 in number, are little bettered in their condition. St. Johns contains only 2,450 inhabitants. The estates are good and productive.

We have received communications from Jamaica, giving ample accounts of the island, with reference to its adaptation to the colored population of the United States, accompanied by earnest solicitations that they may be influenced to emigrate thither. This information has been arranged for publication by an intelligent friend, and will soon be given to the public, so that those for whom it was immediately intended will form their own opinion as to the advisedness of adventuring to Jamaica. Meantime we fully agree with the editor of the *British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Reporter*, when he says :—

No scheme will, or ought to be successful, which does not provide perfect liberty of action to the emigrants, in the selection of their employers and employments, perfect right of locomotion, to go whithersoever their necessities or their inclination may direct, and all the privileges and protection which British subjects can claim from the Government. We counsel our colored friends in the United States not to be led *astray* upon these points, and to listen to none but their friends, when proposals to emigrate are presented to them. They cannot be too cautious how they commit themselves.

The friends of freedom in Canada have recently adopted wise and energetic measures in aid of the anti-slavery cause throughout the world. The "Anti-Slavery Society for Canada" has been formed at Toronto, and likewise a "Ladies' Association." The labors of these societies will be directed, in the first place, to the relief of the large numbers of fugitive slaves from this country, who have been driven away by the Fugitive Slave Bill ; and afterwards to such general objects as they can appropriately attend to, in connection with the emancipationists of this and other lands. We are favored to-day with the presence and co-operation of the Rev. Dr. WILLIS, the esteemed President of the Canada Society, and most cordially welcome him and his coadjutors to the noble field of philanthropy upon which they have entered. The thanks of the friends of freedom and humanity are due to the inhabitants of Canada, for the hospitable and generous aid so freely proffered by them to the suffering individuals and families who have fled to them for succor.

In this connection we are pleased to state that several agents have, during the last year, proceeded to Canada, to exert the best influence in their power over the fugitives that have flocked to that province in years past, and especially those who have gone the last year. They are supplied with the means of instructing the colored population, clothing some of the most destitute fugitives, and aiding them, in various ways, to obtain employment, procure and cultivate land, and train up their children. Our friends in Canada are exerting a good influence in the same direction. We trust the Abolitionists of England will afford their co-operation ; and it may not be improper for us to suggest, that it is highly important that

a plan, on a large scale, should be devised, for the permanent employment of the people of color in Canada, under the direction of competent agents, in agricultural and mechanical pursuits. This will be for their present and future advantage, and the good of the people among whom they have chosen their residence.

Since our last annual meeting intelligence has been received from the Sandwich Islands, that resolutions had been passed by the King, KAMEHA-MEHA, in Privy Council, that all the *government* lands are to be surveyed and laid out into small lots, not exceeding ten acres each, and offered for sale to natives only for the present; and that another act of the Privy Council, of more recent date, sweeps away the last vestige of the feudal tenure, which has proved so detrimental to the interests of all concerned. "It is the crowning act that gives liberty to a nation of serfs."

The African SLAVE-TRADE, although declared by the laws of the United States to be piracy, continues to be carried on; and it is shamefully notorious that Americans and American vessels are largely engaged in it. About a year since three American vessels, captured by British naval ships, were lying at St. Helena, for being engaged in that infamous traffic. Not long after a fourth was added, having on board 11 persons as crew, 30 passengers, and 547 Africans, (441 males, and 106 females.) The name of the vessel last alluded to was Lucy Ann, of Boston, commanded by John Hamilton. As has been usual in such cases, he and the crew were permitted to go on shore unmolested. It is stated in the *Evening Post*, of Feb. 3d, 1851, that out of forty-five vessels engaged in the Brazilian slave-trade, nineteen came from the State of Massachusetts. British war vessels have been vigilant in seizing slave ships, both American and Brazilian, and sending them into port for adjudication, for which they are entitled to the thanks of the civilized world.

It is stated that about thirty thousand slaves are annually brought into Rio de Janeiro, and that the average worth has been estimated at \$175. Mr. Clay, in a speech in the Senate during the last session, on presenting a petition signed by eminent and philanthropic citizens of Rhode-Island, praying for the interference of Congress to put a stop to the African slave-trade, remarked, that 173,000 slaves had been imported into the single province of Rio de Janeiro in 1846-49, and he presumed that as large a number had been imported into other provinces of the Brazilian Empire, as well as the island of Cuba.

On the 4th of September, 1850, a decree in General Assembly was issued by the Emperor of Brazil, Don Pedro, that all Brazilian vessels, found any where, and that foreign vessels coming into Brazilian ports, or anchored in the possessions of Brazil, having slaves on board, will be seized; that the importation of slaves into the imperial territory will be punished as piracy. Whether the Emperor is sincere in his professed efforts for the repression of the slave-trade remains to be seen. The Government of this country has published the following translation of a

communication, addressed by the Chief of the Police at Bahia, Brazil, to the United States Consul at that city :—

In consequence of several commanders and masters of foreign vessels having brought to this port on board of their vessels liberated slaves, (*homens libertos*;) probably unaware that such is expressly prohibited by the law of the 7th of November, 1831, I consider it necessary to inform you, in order that you may make it known to the subjects of your nation therein interested, that all commanders, masters and mates, who may bring to this port liberated slaves, not Brazilian born, subject themselves to a penalty of 100 milrees for every person so brought, and also to the expenses of their re-exportation, as directed by the 8th article of said law, and which I intend for the future to have rigorously enforced.

Secretary of the Police of Bahia, Nov. 7, 1850.

The Chief of Police,

To the Consul of the United States.

IOAO MAURICIO WANDERLEY.

Slaves, in large numbers, continue to be imported into Cuba, under the connivance of the Governor-General, who receives fifty dollars for each negro. All attempts on the part of Great Britain to secure the execution of the treaty prohibiting this execrable commerce, seem to be frustrated by the Spanish authorities, who, while exhibiting a just indignation against the pirates and freebooters who go from this country to molest them, inconsistently enough, sanction a more atrocious system of piracy carried on by their own subjects.

The slave-trade, it has been often and truly said, will not cease while slavery exists. Wherever there is a market, there will be supplies. Abolish the market for slaves, and the slave-trade will expire of course. After many years of arduous toil to put an end to the slave-trade, Wilberforce and his compeers learned that it was in vain to attempt its suppression while slavery existed. They then bent their efforts to the extinction of the market in the British West Indies. Since then, England has, at immense expense and constant negotiation, been endeavoring to suppress the slave-trade throughout the world; but her efforts have been in vain, and must be while slavery keeps up the demand for slaves. Even if she compels, as she should have done long since, powers with which she has formed treaties for the suppression of the slave-trade to fulfil their obligations, the traffic will not be terminated, for the reasons already stated. In spite of all the treaties that may be negotiated, in spite of all the efforts made in good faith for their observance, in spite of all the cruising squadrons that may vex the seas, while slavery exists and is profitable the slave-trade will be prosecuted. The cupidity of slaveholders will be an over-match for the skill of ambassadors and the prowess of men-of-war.

The slaveholders of the United States, with hypocritical effrontery, profess to be the enemies of the slave-trade. Declamation succeeds declamation from Mr. Clay, and other members of Congress, against the piratical *foreign* slave-trade, while they sustain the *domestic* slave-trade, a crime equally cruel and odious! Even in the capital of the nation, under the very eyes of ambassadors from foreign courts, the manacled slave is bought and sold, driven through the streets, and carried off in chains to all

parts of the slave States. What is stigmatized as *piracy*, if committed on the coast of Africa or on the high seas, is deemed lawful and respectable trade, if committed on our own territory, even in the city of Washington ! One of our slaveholding and slave-trading judges may condemn to death a wretched man, convicted of trading in negroes on a foreign shore, while he dreams not that, in the eye of reason and of God, he stands convicted of a similar crime.

The British people are divided in opinion with regard to the CRUISING SYSTEM. The Anti-Slavery Society contend that it increases rather than diminishes the slave-trade, which can only be suppressed, they allege, by an enforcement of treaties, and by the use of steam vessels ; while the missionary societies have petitioned that the squadron on the coast of Africa should not be removed. Sir C. Hotham, one of the ablest commanders ever sent to that coast, has given his deliberate opinion that the slave-trade cannot be essentially crippled or permanently checked while the demand for slaves continues to be so great. He thinks the slave-trade "is entirely dependent upon the commercial demand for slaves, and has little or no connection with the squadron."

The *Edinburgh Review* has an article in the November number, upon the usefulness of the cruising vessels on the coast of Africa, and states the result of its investigation, with the prediction that the withdrawal of the squadron will greatly increase the slave-trade, and produce other disastrous results. The remarkable success of the Kow-Mendi Mission, under the superintendence of the American Missionary Association, in suppressing war and promoting the arts of peace, demonstrates that nothing short of the benign influences of the gospel, preached by men who consistently recommend peace and temperance, will put an end to the sanguinary wars that prevail among the different tribes, and which, more than anything else, promote the slave-trade. The encouragement of an honest and fair trade with the natives will also lessen the temptation to wage war, will encourage the industry of the people, and lessen the introduction of intoxicating drinks and warlike instruments into the interior of Africa. Christianity consistently exhibited, accompanied by a commercial interchange of *useful* articles, will do more to put an end to the slave-trade than all the cruising squadrons that may be sent to the coast of Africa by both Europe and America.

We believe that the Constitution of the United States, interpreted according to its obvious meaning, is in harmony with the higher law of the Supreme Ruler, and therefore binding upon the people of this nation. What then are its leading features, bearing upon the question now in issue between Slavery and Freedom ?

1. "The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."—*Const. U. S., Art. 4, Sec. 2.*

Therefore, it is unconstitutional for South-Carolina, or any other State,

to imprison the colored seamen of Massachusetts, who repair to their ports on lawful business, or to expel agents deputed to visit such States to take legal steps to test the constitutionality of their laws for the imprisonment of colored seamen.*

2. "No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due."—*Const. U. S.*, Art. 4, Sec. 2.

Mark the phraseology—"under the laws thereof." Said Senator Mason, of Virginia, in debate, alluding to the remarks of another Senator:—

If he means by this, that proof shall be brought that slavery is established by existing laws, it is impossible to comply with the requisition, for no such proof can be produced, I apprehend, in any of the slave States. *I am not aware that there is a single State in which the institution is established by positive law.*

Mr. George Wood, in his argument in the case of the fugitive, Henry Long, admitted the same thing. He said, "Slavery has grown up in this country by usage, and has been recognized as a sort of American common law."† A sort of common law, truly! Is human liberty to be jeopardized under such loose construction of law as this? It will not be pretended that the expression in the Constitution, "under the laws thereof," refers to the common law in its usual acceptation. The framers of that instrument used language, it is universally conceded, with remarkable precision. Had they intended to refer to the common law, would they not have said, "No person held to service or labor in one State under the common or statute law thereof"? The clause in the Constitution applies to all persons legally held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof—to white apprentices; and there is more evidence that the framers of the Constitution meant this clause to apply to such persons than to slaves.‡

The words "slave" and "slavery" do not appear in the Constitution. That instrument does not authorize Congress to legislate on behalf of

* By the laws of Massachusetts, colored men are citizens; they are also citizens by the laws of Virginia; and, in fact, are citizens of all the States, entitled to all the privileges in each State that are accorded to natives of such State of the same description.

† *New-York Evening Post.*

‡ Daniel Webster, in a speech at Buffalo, recently, made an important admission on this subject. He says: "At that day, [when the Constitution was framed,] there was a great system of apprenticeship at the North, and many apprentices at the North, taking advantage of circumstances, and of vessels sailing to the South, thereby escaped. That led to a clear, express, and well-defined provision in the Constitution of the country on the subject."

Another historical fact is found in the *Southern Press*, the acknowledged organ of the slaveholders at Washington, which denies that the article in the Constitution for the reclamation of persons held to service was a concession to the South, or a compromise. It says also, "that, at the very time this Constitution was adopted, and at the very place where it was framed,—Philadelphia,—large numbers of poor foreign emigrants were arriving, who paid their passage by selling their freedom (services) for a term of years. . . . It is manifest, also, that since—as is well known—there was a greater tendency among these white men to 'escape from service' than among slaves, and since these 'Redemptioners' went almost entirely North, it is plain that the provision in the Constitution respecting fugitives from service was even more favorable to the North than the South."

slavery, nor did its framers intend that the Government of this country should ever sanction or uphold it. It is therefore unconstitutional for Congress to make laws for the establishment, regulation, or protection of slavery in any district of the United States or elsewhere; to authorize magistrates to commit to the United States prisons any man suspected of being a fugitive slave, or the marshal to sell at auction such a person for jail fees; or to open negotiations with foreign governments for the recovery of slaves who have taken refuge in Canada or any foreign country or territory.

If, however, this instrument be interpreted by contemporaneous history, let the friends of liberty, as well as the advocates of human bondage, have an equal benefit in such an exposition. How will the case then stand? It is well known that the Convention that framed the Constitution had no intention of guaranteeing, extending, or perpetuating slavery. Even the members from the South were prominent and explicit on the subject. Mr. Webster says, that "Mr. Madison," who was the most eloquent debater in the body, and one of its principal members, "opposed the introduction of the term 'slave' or 'slavery' into the Constitution; for he said HE DID NOT WISH TO SEE IT RECOGNIZED BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA THAT THERE COULD BE PROPERTY IN MAN."

It is also a matter of history, that, at the adoption of the Constitution by the people of the United States,* it was expected by the whole country, South and North, that slavery would speedily come to an end, by natural causes, the progress of public sentiment, and legislative acts of emancipation. The debates in the State Conventions, the correspondence of eminent men in various parts of the country, the prevailing sentiment of the people at the time, as handed down to posterity, bear witness to the correctness of this statement. Its truth is corroborated by the fact, that societies for the abolition of slavery were formed soon after the adoption of the Constitution, and that several of the most distinguished members of the great Convention that framed it became Presidents of these Anti-slavery Societies.*

Is it said, by the friends or apologists of slavery, that the history of the times shows that slaves were *meant* in the carefully-worded clauses of the Constitution claimed to be compromises or guarantees? The enemies and denouncers of the hateful system prove by the same history: 1.

* It is contended by some, that the Constitution was adopted by the States in their sovereign capacity. This is a great error. For convenience, the people assembled in Convention in each State by their delegates, as they do in each town when called upon to deliberate upon a new form of government; but the Constitution was adopted by the People of the United States. The preamble commences thus: "*We, the People of the United States*, in order to form a more perfect union," &c. Anterior to the adoption of the Constitution, there was a confederacy of the States, but the adoption of the Constitution put an end to it. Washington, in his Inaugural Address, recognizes this fact.

That it was not intended that slavery should ever extend beyond the old thirteen States ; and 2. That it was the general expectation that it would soon be abolished throughout the Union. We contend, then, that whether the Constitution be interpreted according to its letter, or by its letter and contemporaneous history, slavery does not constitutionally exist in that part of the country beyond the boundaries of the old thirteen States, if it constitutionally exists at all. We contend that the inter-State slave-trade, all protection and regulation of slavery or the domestic slave-trade, and all legislation on the subject of fugitive slaves by Congress, as well as all connection with the institution or its adjuncts by the Government, are without constitutional authority. If this be so, what an enormous usurpation has been practised by the Slave Power of this country ; how egregiously have a large portion of the people of the free States been deceived ; how imperfectly has the Constitution been understood ; how unconstitutional have been the acts of Congress on the subject of slavery ; and how gratuitously have anti-slavery-men been maligned.

In view of these facts it may be asked, Will the people of this country for ever allow themselves to be misled by demagogues, by false expositions of the Constitution, by absurd exegeses of Scripture on the subject of slavery ? Will the people of the free States consent, for all time, that a comparative fraction, who persist in holding their fellow-men as property, under what are falsely called the compromises and guarantees of the Constitution, shall hold up that instrument *in terrorem* over them ? Shall Northern demagogues, rightly named dough-faces by their Southern masters, always represent the people of the free States in the Congress of the United States, willingly surrender the interpretation of the Constitution and the administration of public affairs to the Slave Power, and content themselves with the small portion of offices and jobs dealt out to them, as rewards for their recreant subserviency, by an arrogant minority ?

The world was given to understand that this government was founded to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty ;" not mainly to protect property or enrich the nation, nor to acquire renown by feats of arms. Are we so degenerated, so false to the principles of the Declaration of Independence, so indifferent to the welfare of mankind, so utterly selfish, as to be willing that the world should now understand that this nation will deliberately do what they think will give it the most fame, the most territory, the most money ! Are we ready to withdraw our allegiance to God, place ourselves under the dominion of Mammon, and say, "Be thou our god" ?

Will the people of the North stand still, and see the anti-slavery band, which so resolutely opposes the existence of slavery, and does all it

* BENJAMIN FRANKLIN was President of the Pennsylvania Society, and JOHN JAY of the New-York Society.

consistently can for its abolition, without coming up to their help, swelling their numbers, and striving to save the country? Let millions of voices answer, NO! Let them exclaim, We will maintain the Union of the States, and the Constitution in its anti-slavery beauty and grandeur, with a firm reliance upon the God of our fathers; we will divorce the General Government from all participation in slavery or the slave-trade, domestic and foreign; no other slave State shall be admitted into the Union; no person held to service or labor shall ever be surrendered without the verdict of a jury; no colored citizen of the North shall ever be imprisoned in Southern ports under unconstitutional enactments; slavery shall be abolished for ever in the District of Columbia, and never curse any of our Territories; the inter-State slave-trade shall cease; and if the slaveholders of the United States persist in holding slaves, in view of the superiority of free over slave labor, against the principles of political economy and the denunciations of Scripture, in spite of warning and entreaty, **THEY WILL DO IT AT THEIR OWN PERIL.**

Nearly eighteen years ago fifty-six men, from different States, met in convention in Philadelphia, formed a National Anti-Slavery Society, and promulgated a Declaration of Sentiments to their countrymen. They were men devoid of political influence, and few had wealth or prominent stations in society. But they had considered the subject of slavery, its opposition to the principles of the government, its inhumanity, its ruinous tendency, the reproach it had brought on the country, and its guilt in the sight of God; and with sincere love to their country, sympathy for their oppressed fellow-men, and reverence for the Governor of nations, they resolved to lift up a voice of remonstrance, entreaty and warning, and to take such measures as were feasible, in the hope that by the blessing of God they should be able to arouse their countrymen to a sense of their iniquity and danger, and induce them to relinquish a system so ruinous to men and so offensive to the Almighty.

The promulgation of these sentiments, and the fearless but discreet advocacy of them, threw the country into great agitation. Slaveholders were exasperated. Northern men with Southern principles, of all professions, sympathized with them. Merchants in the Southern trade became alarmed, and sycophantic politicians were denunciatory. Priests and Levites passed by on the other side. But the truth found its way, and did its appropriate work. Persons connected with slavery saw their error and became zealous emancipationists. Here and there a politician, at the risk of losing his popularity, boldly advocated the cause of freedom. Clergymen, in various parts of the country, dared to be singular and intrepid on the side of human rights. And now we find that the God of the oppressed has opened the eyes of a great multitude of our fellow-citizens to the enormous guilt and danger of slavery, so that men in every profession and position in society are adopting the sentiments and pursuing the

measures of the early Abolitionists. The opposition, however, in the free as well as in the slave States, is strong and virulent. Commercial interests, political ambition, and theological prejudice are arrayed against the cause, and the men who advocate it. But in spite of these, the anti-slavery sentiment is advancing to a glorious consummation.

It is not pretended that the anti-slavery people of this country have been perfect in all their doctrines or measures. Amidst the misrepresentations and opposition of their opponents, the denunciations of men in official stations, the libels of the press, the annoyances to which they have been subjected in their social, business, and church relations, Abolitionists have not been exempt from the infirmities of human nature. Unhappy divisions have occurred in their ranks, and it has been the policy of pro-slavery men to attribute to the whole what are deemed the errors of a few. Still the history of the cause will show that the doctrines and measures of the great body of Abolitionists in this country have been similar to those of their English brethren, and that the opposition encountered here has been like the opposition experienced by Clarkson, Wilberforce, Macaulay, and their coadjutors in their day. It is time that it was well understood that there is error in opposing well-intended plans of reform, fanaticism in abusing reformers, and guilt in standing aloof when men are ready to perish under grievous oppression, when the country is disgraced by upholding slavery and caste, when the Bible is dishonored by pro-slavery expositions, and the ministry and the Church refuse to contend earnestly for humanity.

The Abolitionists of this country, like their predecessors in Great Britain, have been engaged in an arduous, self-denying, and unpopular cause. As a body they have been actuated by high and noble principles. They have devoted strength, expended money, and risked reputation in honest efforts to enlighten their countrymen, and bring about a great moral reformation. Opposed as they have been by those who should have co-operated with them, and forsaken by some who made loud professions of attachment to the cause, they have never despaired of ultimate success. They are as confident now as when the contest began, that by the blessing of God the enterprise will succeed, that victory will crown their efforts, that the enslaved will be emancipated, and the country saved. It behooves then all who aim to discharge their duty, as Christian Abolitionists, in view of the past and the future, to profit by experience, be thankful for all the good that has been accomplished, and in the emphatic language of the aged CLARKSON, "persevere." Let them diffuse, with unsparing liberality, anti-slavery publications, seek for political and church relations in which they can exert an efficient anti-slavery influence, devote their property to the promotion of the cause, and above all, lift up continually their supplications to the Almighty for wisdom from on high.

Anti-slavery truth is pervading the nation. Recreant politicians are

meeting the frowns of betrayed and indignant constituents.* Lower-law ecclesiastics are mistaking the applause of those interested in slavery for the voice of the community, and the people are coming to understand their true interests and their duties. Thus God in judgment is remembering mercy. His promises are sure. "He shall judge the poor of the people; he shall save the children of the needy; and shall break in pieces the oppressor."

In behalf of the Executive Committee,

LEWIS TAPPAN, *Corresponding Secretary.*

* A most signal proof of this truth is found in the recent election of Hon. CHARLES SUMNER to the Senate of the United States, by the unsolicited suffrages of the Legislature of Massachusetts, in opposition to those who, by allying themselves to the Slave Power, to advance their selfish political fortunes, have forfeited the confidence of many who had hitherto delighted to do them honor, and covered themselves with deserved reproach.

BUSINESS MEETING.

A MEETING of the Society was held, agreeably to adjournment, in the Lecture-Room of the Broadway Tabernacle, May 6th, at 9 o'clock A. M. The President, ARTHUR TAPPAN, in the chair.

Prayer was offered by Rev. H. H. KELLOGG, of Oneida county, N. Y.

Messrs. S. S. Jocelyn, George Trask and Samuel Denning were appointed a Committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year.

The Corresponding Secretary stated that Mr. R. G. WILLIAMS, lately deceased, and formerly a member of the Executive Committee, left a legacy of one thousand dollars to this Society; and that he spent considerable time, especially during the last month of his life, in circulating anti-slavery publications, and in benevolent labors among the people of color.

He also presented a manuscript on the present condition of Jamaica, with particular reference to its being an inviting place for colored emigrants from this country, written by Samuel Allison, Jr., of New-Jersey, and at the request of the meeting read a part of it. On motion, it was referred to the Executive Committee for publication.

He stated that a newspaper has been lately commenced in this city in the German language, entitled the *Working Man's Gazette*, edited by a German refugee, who has recently arrived in this country; and that an Anti-Slavery Society has recently been formed at Toronto, Canada West; also, a Ladies' Anti-Slavery Association for the relief of fugitives.

On motion, it was unanimously

Resolved, That we rejoice in the formation of these Societies; that we proffer to them our co-operation, and desire their friendly correspondence; and that we tender to the Rev. Dr. Willis, the President of the Anti-Slavery Society of Canada, our thanks for attending the annual meeting and assisting us with his counsel.

The Rev. Dr. WILLIS, being present, addressed the Society in acknowledgment of the complimentary resolution which had been adopted.

He had been present when the Society just mentioned by the chairman was formed; the meeting was the largest ever seen in Toronto; the Mayor of the city had presided. A Ladies' Association, to administer to the wants of poor fugitives, had also been formed, and it was in the most friendly spirit to the United States, that they had thus associated themselves to aid the efforts of the friends of liberty and humanity here; and it was by the use of such moral means as their common Christianity permitted them to employ. We act from no international jealousy. We admire much that is American, though we hate slavery. We, of Britain, were too long in the sin ourselves; we should only, however, be the more earnest in seeking

America to go with us in the repentance and reformation. Noble revolutions you have already accomplished. We, he said, aye, every Briton worthy of the name, sympathized with your struggles which won for you National Independence (Cheers.) None seek to defend the oppression which goaded you. But now we long to see the emancipation of the millions who groan upon your own soil, under the worst of all tyranny. I rejoice that I was present yesterday at your meeting, to hear the facts and reasoning of Mr. Beecher. They have confirmed me in sentiments which I have long held, and especially show that great blame attaches to many of your churches and professed expounders of the Word of God. They had confirmed him, the Rev. speaker continued, in his opinion of the low state of religion and morals in the slaveholding churches of the South; though, strange to say, he had sometimes been met in Britain by the allegation that the religion of those places exceeded the average Christianity of British or Scotch churches. He had believed this to be a rash and groundless statement; but never knew the fact so well as he had now learned it in the presence of the assembled thousands of their enlightened citizens. How could they expect religion to prosper where a system was connived at which withheld the Word of God from millions of rational beings, and blotted out marriage, and practically tolerated licentiousness? He had heard of difficulties which were alleged to stand in the way of religious bodies asserting the whole truth. But he knew of no excuses which should be sustained for the neglect of the obvious duty of churches to remonstrate and expostulate with the framers of these laws. Had they done so? Were they not neglecting an obvious obligation in not doing it, and not persisting in doing it till their voices should be heard? Oh, he knew not what to think of this enormous guilt, and the affecting apathy which it bespoke! Some one, speaking of war, had remarked on the strange circumstance that familiarity with the accounts of military dispatches made many think so little and feel so little in reading of thousands falling in one day the victims of the sword while a tale of a solitary murder, or one death by violence, often called forth a larger amount of feeling. It seemed as if the magnitude of a moral evil, too, lessened the sense of it. As he looked at the noble scene yesterday,—at the three thousand who composed the respectable and truly intelligent-looking assembly,—Now, he reflected within himself, what would a slaveholder, a professing Christian slaveholder, say, if he pointed even to as many as these three thousand and were to say, From so many is cruelly withheld the blessed Word of salvation, for which you profess to bless God every day that you and your families possess it? Even of three thousand, met together, the sight is almost fitted to awe one accustomed to address his fellow-men; but could he have pointed to a thousand times three thousand, for that is the amount, and said, These, these millions are, by your inhuman laws, degraded morally as well as physically; doomed, he had almost said damned, as far as the law of man could so consign and doom them, to spiritual ignorance; who, who could stand up to plead for such a law? But especially could any man pretend Bible authority for planting himself between his fellow-creatures and the God who made him, and saying in effect, You shall not know that Word, which to know and search is the command of the world's Saviour?

Dr. Willis entered on the argument from the Old Testament sometimes alleged in favor of slavery. So far as such a system existed with the Almighty's approbation, it was by a limited and temporary permission. It bore no resemblance to the modern slavery which it was quoted to sanction, and any modern nation, not having a commission as direct as the Jews, to execute God's judgments on another nation, would in vain plead such a precedent against the obvious bearing of the law of nature, God's own moral law, to do justly and to love mercy. They might as well quote the command to exterminate the Canaanites as a precedent for invading at their pleasure, and annihilating, any conterminous, unoffending people. He needed not to add anything to what was so well said yesterday in exposition of the law of the New Testament. The Epistle to Philemon had been rescued from the cause of the slaveholder, which assuredly it had never been intended to serve. Its whole spirit was repugnant to every thing not reconcilable with the love of the Christian brotherhood, and it should never be forgotten that the servitude against which they were contending was forced servitude, and servitude on conditions incompatible with equity, with the recognition of the rights of conscience, and of the rights of humanity. What resemblance had slavery like this to the willing return of Onesimus to a master of whom Paul said that he would even do more than he asked in promoting his well-being as a brother in the Lord?

He was happy to say that he had not heard of any case of crime or depredation justly chargeable to the fugitives in the district in which he resided. They felt too

grateful to be offenders, and their own people freely aided them according to their ability. Dr. Willis said, some persons in Canada had prejudices against colored people, and spoke of their bad conduct in some districts. He always, in reply, asked if an equal number of white people, in the same districts, were not called up to the bar for offenses; and if the blame, when offenses were committed, should not be thrown chiefly upon those who had oppressed them? Dr. Willis said that he had been asked in Canada, Why do you form Anti-Slavery Societies here? His answer was, We have to attend to these poor refugees as men and as Christians; we have to do with it in self-defense. In these days of telegraphic communication, when men are brought so near together, we feel that those who have lived at a distance from each other form one community, and that they have moral as well as commercial relations.

He said there had been some difficulty in Canada about colored children attending the same schools with white children. In consequence of this, a Society had been formed at Toronto, under the auspices of the Synod with which he is connected, to purchase land, encourage the people of color to settle on it, have their own schools, &c. This was not done to effect a permanent separation between white and colored people. The white people living near the proposed location were stirred up to opposition, and bloodshed was threatened if the colored people should form a settlement near them. But the Synod disregarded it; they persevered, and the threats subsided. And now, instead of treating the colored people coldly, the whites are seeking access to the schools, so that, at the present time, one half of the children are white. Dr. Willis concluded by assuring the meeting of the continued sympathy and co-operation of the Society which he represented, and sat down amid the cheers of the auditory.

The Corresponding Secretary communicated letters from Thomas Jones, Esq., Secretary of the Anti-Slavery Society in the island of Barbadoes, containing resolutions adopted with reference to the Fugitive Slave Law; the resolutions adopted at a public meeting in the island on the same subject; and interesting facts in relation to the workings of emancipation, and the present condition of the island.

A resolution was offered respecting the American Home Missionary Society, which affords aid, it is said, to sixty-three ministers who preach to slaveholding churches. Rev. GEORGE WHIPPLE said, that being the Secretary of another Missionary Board, he felt some delicacy in speaking on this subject. For years he had been distressed at the attitude assumed by the Home Missionary Society, the A. B. C. F. M., the Sunday-school, Bible, and Tract Societies, with regard to slavery, and he had been anxiously hoping that they would do something effectual in aid of the great cause of emancipation. But it was in vain. They did nothing. If a thousand dollars were offered for a prize essay on the sinfulness of American slavery, the Tract Society would not publish it. And he did not see how these Societies could do otherwise, so long as they maintained their connection with slaveholders. It is not known that one of the missionaries of the Home Missionary Society in slave States dares present slaveholding as a barrier to Christian communion. They believe that taking that ground would exclude them altogether from preaching in a slaveholding community.

Mr. J. BIGELOW, of Washington City, said he had lately made application to the Home Missionary Society for aid in organizing a new Congregational church in that city, which had been refused on the

ground that they did not afford aid to such enterprises where there were church organizations in the same place to which they could have access. And yet, he said, that Society gave aid to two slaveholding churches in Washington.

Rev. Mr. COLVER, of Boston, said, that he believed every Missionary Board had the power to control the action of its missionaries, and they found no difficulty in doing it, except in cases connected with the slavery question. They can say, You must not tolerate Mohammedanism, polygamy, &c. : why not include slavery ? If any people to whom they preach will not receive such a gospel, let the missionaries shake off the dust of their feet and leave them. He stated what his own denomination, the Baptist, had done. They had taken strong ground, and slaveholders had to submit to it. If a Board will not do this, they are traitors to the cause of Christ. For one, he would not stay where he could not preach a whole gospel. No man or society has any right to let the gospel down to suit wicked men. He related a conversation he had lately held with a non-professing lawyer, who told him that the conduct of the Societies named was making infidels faster than they made Christians ; and also the remark of two young men, of good moral character, and from orthodox families, who attended on the preaching of a man who was ardently engaged in the anti-slavery cause, but whose doctrinal opinions were very unsound,—that they preferred infidelity with humanity to orthodoxy without it.

Mr. WHIPPLE, after some explanation, moved the following resolution as a substitute for the other, and it was adopted :—

Resolved, That Arthur Tappan, Dr. Lansing, and G. Whipple, be a committee to address a memorial on behalf of this Society, to Missionary Societies that aid churches or ministers in States or Territories where slaveholding prevails, praying them to refuse aid to ministers or churches that do not practically treat slaveholding as other known sins.

The Committee on Nominations made a report, which was accepted and the following persons were appointed officers for the ensuing year :—

President.—ARTHUR TAPPAN.

Vice Presidents.—F. JULIUS LE MOYNE and WILLIAM JAY.

Corresponding Secretary.—LEWIS TAPPAN.

Recording Secretary.—C. B. RAY.

Treasurer.—WILLIAM E. WHITING.

Executive Committee.—ARTHUR TAPPAN, S. S. JOCELYN, WILLIAM JAY, LEWIS TAPPAN, WM. E. WHITING, JOSHUA LEAVITT, LUTHER LEE, S. E. CORNISH, JAMES WARNER, ALEXANDER MACDONALD, ARNOLD BUFFUM, GEORGE WHIPPLE, THOMAS RITTER, J. W. C. PENNINGTON, E. D. CULVER, D. C. LANSING, WM. B. COLLINS, CHARLES PARKER, A. E. EVEREST.

Corresponding Members.—Joseph Sturge, George Wm. Alexander, Samuel Bowly, John Scoble, and Thomas Harvey, Esqrs., Rev. James Carlile, D.D., and Rev. J. Howard Hinton, of England; Professor Ackersdyke, Utrecht, Holland; Dr. Carové, Frankfort, Germany; M. Isambert, Paris; M. D'Instant, Hayti; W. W. Anderson, Esq., Jamaica; Rev. John Galloway, New-Brunswick; J. H. Collins, Esq., Illinois; Hon. S. C. Stevens, Indiana; Hon. S. P. Chase, Ohio; Prof. C. D. Cleveland, Pennsylvania; William Goodell, New-York; Rev. G. W. Perkins, Connecticut; John G. Whittier, Massachusetts; Rev. Dr. Willis, of Toronto, Canada; and Thomas Jones, Esq., of Barbadoes.

Rev. A. E. EVEREST, Pastor of the Colored Church in Prince street, Brooklyn, offered the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is our duty to oppose, with more than usual energy, the extraordinary efforts now making by Colonizationists, inasmuch as they are founded in the most unjust prejudices against the colored people.

The mover, and Mr. GEORGE DOWNING, supported the resolution, after which it was adopted.

Rev. H. BELDEN offered the following resolution, which was adopted:—

Resolved, That the Executive Committee be requested to take into consideration the propriety of having the next annual meeting commence in the forenoon of the second Tuesday of May.

Rev. Mr. TRASK, of Massachusetts, made some remarks on the importance of reviving prayer-meetings among anti-slavery people. Mr. HOWE, of New-Jersey, spoke of the importance of Abolitionists contributing more liberally to the treasury of the Society.

On motion, it was

Resolved, That the thanks of the Society be presented to Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Rev. Dr. Willis, and Rev. C. G. Finney, for the addresses made by them at the anniversary, and that they be requested to furnish them for publication.

Adjourned.

(Attest,)

LEWIS TAPPAN, *Secretary pro tem.*

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
Abbott Lawrence,.....	68	Bryan, Joseph, of Alabama,.....	73
A. B. C. F. M.,.....	62	Bunkum signatures,.....	22
no action on slavery,.....	63	Burt, Hon. A., on the progress of anti-slavery,.....	84
policy in preaching the gospel,.....	75	Business meeting,.....	110
Abolition strength in New-Orleans,.....	84	Butler, B. F., alluded to,.....	67
Abolitionists have no cause for discouragement,.....	19	Butler, Senator,.....	79
Abolitionists not to be disheartened,.....	108	California,.....	95
Abolitionists, statements of, endorsed by H. Clay and R. J. Breckenridge,.....	72	Campbellites, slaves owned by,.....	56
Address to non-slaveholders,.....	68	Canada :	
African mail steamers,.....	73	anti-slavery societies in,.....	100
Agent to New-Mexico,.....	93	hospitable reception of fugitives,.....	31
Albert Barnes,.....	51	Candler, John,.....	87
Alexander, G. W.,.....	97	Card of Bowen & M'Namee,.....	31
Almanac, Liberty,.....	88	Carové, Dr.,.....	96, 97
Am. and For. Anti-Slavery Society :		Caste :	
on the original platform,.....	90	among Friends in North Carolina,.....	44
American Baptist Free Mission Society,.....	70	among Sons of Temperance,.....	90, 91
American Bible Society :		days numbered in India,.....	92
no "fund for slaves,".....	68	in Episcopal church,.....	90
American Colonization Society,.....	71	not allowed at M'Grawville college,.....	70
American Home Mission Society :		Castle Garden meeting,.....	31
its inconsistency,.....	65	Catch the minister,.....	23
memorial to,.....	64	Cause, the, in Virginia,.....	86
refuses aid to church at Washington,.....	112	Chains, Boston court-house in,.....	28
American League of colored seamen,.....	92	Charleston (S. C.) Union Presbytery,.....	83
American Missionary Ass.,.....	43, 63, 68, 69, 103	Chaplin, W. L.,.....	108
Anderson, Dr.,.....	63	Cheever, Rev. Dr.,.....	37
Andover, Rhetorical Society at,.....	70	Cherokee Indians,.....	75
Andover students, petition of,.....	70	Chevalier Clausen,.....	95, 96
Anniversary meeting,.....	3	Chickering on population,.....	87
Annual meeting,.....	30	Christ and the apostles, example of,.....	65, 66
Annual Report,.....	19	Christianity not pro-slavery,.....	57
Antigua,.....	97	Church slaveholding,.....	56
Anti-slavery :		Cities, poor soil for reform,.....	55
in Germany,.....	96	Citizens, colored people treated as,.....	93
literature for the South,.....	68	Clark, Rev. Rufus W.,.....	38
men not pretended perfect,.....	108	Clark, Rev. W. C., rejected resolution,.....	60
progress in the South,.....	84	Clausen, Chevalier,.....	95, 96
Society, British and Foreign,.....	97	Clay, Cassius M.,.....	88, 89
Apostles, how did they teach,.....	65, 66	Clay, Henry :	
Arrest of colporteurs,.....	68	brought up case of Shadrach in U. S. Senate,.....	89
Arrests under fugitive slave law,.....	23, 40	denial that slaveholders breed slaves for sale,.....	82
Association, American Missionary,.....	43	inconsistency,.....	72
Bacon, Rev. J. C.,.....	77	what he said before the Col. Soc.,.....	71
Bahia, consular communication,.....	102	Colleges, students taking anti-slavery ground,.....	70
Bailey, Dr., on population statistics,.....	87	Colonies, Danish,.....	99
Baptist Am. Free Mission Soc.,.....	70	Colonies, English,.....	97
Baptists, New-England,.....	70	Colonies, French,.....	99
Baptists, number of slaves owned by,.....	56	Colonization, recommends steamers to Africa,.....	71
Barbadoes,.....	97	Colored people :	
Barnes, Rev. Albert,.....	57	churches broken up,.....	31
Beecher, Rev. Charles,.....	38	consternation and distress,.....	30
Beecher, Rev. H. W., speech at anniversary,.....	5	education of,.....	92
Beman, Rev. Dr., on fugitive law,.....	33	exhibition at Philadelphia,.....	92
Bermuda, encouragement from,.....	98	good behavior of in Canada,.....	31
Berrien, Senator,.....	79	in California,.....	95
Betts, Captain, driven from Alabama,.....	77	in Cherokee nation,.....	75
Bible for slaves,.....	68	increase of kind feeling towards,.....	46, 91
Bible withheld from slaves,.....	111	in Detroit,.....	92
Bonnet, Rev. Louis,.....	97	in South Carolina,.....	75
Boston, disclaimer of anti-fugitive law men,.....	31	manifest improvement of,.....	92
Bowen & M'Namee, card of,.....	31	mechanics,.....	92
Brazil, slave-trade in,.....	101	must elevate themselves,.....	92
Breckenridge, Dr. R. J.,.....	57	persecution of in Maryland,.....	74
Breeding of slaves for sale,.....	82	persecution of in Missouri,.....	74
Bribe to commissioners,.....	48	progress among,.....	98
British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society,.....	97		

	PAGE		PAGE
seamen, imprisonment of,.....	77-80	English colonies,.....	97
stringent measures against,.....	71	Episcopalians, slaves owned by,.....	58
their resolutions respecting Garnett,.....	25	<i>Era</i> , National, on population statistics,....	88
treated as citizens,.....	93	Even Webster not safe,.....	51
what said about them at Col. Society		Factories at the South,.....	33
meetings,.....	71	Fanaticism in abusing reformers,.....	108
Colporteur arrested in Kentucky,.....	68	Fathers, their views and intentions,.....	64
Colver, Rev. Nathaniel,.....	36, 113	Fee, Rev. J. G.,.....	7
<i>Commonwealth</i> , disclaimer of,.....	51	Feudal tenure abolished in Sandwich Islands,....	100
Compromise measures, enumeration of,....	20	Fillmore, President, in 1838,.....	21
Concert by colored people,.....	92	Fillmore, Pres., on last Gen. Ass.,.....	61
Congress not authorized to legislate for sla-		Finney, Rev. C. G.,.....	16
very,.....	105	Flax-cotton in England,.....	95
Consternation of colored people,.....	30	“ “ in Kentucky,.....	96
Constitution of the United States,.....	103	Forbes, Lieut., on Liberia,.....	72
adopted by the people,.....	105	Formation of National Anti-slavery Society	
article 4, sec. 2,.....	104	in 1833,.....	107
avoids words <i>slave</i> or <i>slavery</i> ,.....	54, 105	Frankfort, Germany, anti-slavery at,.....	96
Daniel Webster on,.....	47	Franklin, Benjamin,.....	25
in favor of liberty,.....	106	an emancipationist,.....	106
intentions of its framers,.....	105	Free colored people “nuisances,”.....	72
Constitutional methods of action,.....	107	<i>Free Presbyterian</i> ,.....	89
Contemporaneous history of the U. S. Con-		Free Presbyterian Church,.....	43
stitution,.....	10	Free Will Baptist Conference,.....	43
Conventions:		French colonies,.....	99
Episcopal, of Pa., at Lowell, Mass,.....	70	<i>Friend of India</i> ,.....	92
at Medina, Ohio,.....	70	Friends, quarterly meeting of,.....	44
at Ottawa, Ill.,.....	69	<i>Frontier Guardian</i> ,.....	94
at Philadelphia, 1833,.....	107	Fugitive Slave Bill,.....	20
Cotton:		attempts to make the North a hunting-	
flax,.....	95, 96	ground,.....	71
free labor,.....	95	attempts to show its constitutionality,....	47
from Jamaica,.....	95	Beecher, H. W., on,.....	12, 37
preachers,.....	22	cruel and inhuman,.....	40, 50, 53
up, emancipation down,.....	82	Free Will Baptist Conference on,.....	43
Court-house in chains,.....	28	familiarizes the North with slavery,....	54
Crafts, William and Ellen, case of,.....	27	has made us a slaveholding nation,.....	53
Crittenden, J. J., on last Gen. Ass.,.....	61	how regarded abroad,.....	17
Crooks, Rev. Adam,.....	77	is a persecution of conscientious men,....	55
Crowell, Rev. William,.....	35	its operation has awakened sympathy,....	55
Cruelties practised on free colored people,...	74	its unconstitutionality,.....	47, 48
Cruising system,.....	103	meetings against,.....	46
Cruz, Santa,.....	99	most insulting feature of the compromise,...	20
Cuba,.....	102	pamphlet by Ex. Com.,.....	24
Damages for intoxicating a slave,.....	74	petition of Andover students,.....	70
Damocles' sword over officers,.....	52	rekindled bad passions of slaveholders,...	52
Danish colonies,.....	99	turpitude of the bill,.....	48
Davidson, Rev. Dr., on fugitive law,.....	33	who voted for it,.....	20, 21
Davis, Senator, on introduction of slavery		Fugitives, how received in Canada,.....	100
in new territories,.....	94	Fugitive slaves, and U. S. Constitution,....	104
Deception of free states, egregious,.....	106	rapid escape of, from Md. and Va.,.....	68
Declaration of abolitionists in 1833,.....	107	Fugitive slave cases:	
Defense of A. H. M. S.,.....	65	Garnett,.....	25
Demagogues, shall they always rule,.....	106	Gibson,.....	25
Democracy not pro-slavery,.....	57	Hamlet,.....	24
Dewey, Rev. Dr.,.....	35	Long,.....	26
Discourses of ministers, pro-slavery,....	33, 35	the Crafts,.....	27
anti-slavery,.....	36, 39	Shadrach,.....	27
Disgraceful scenes at Richmond, Va.,.....	75, 76	Sims,.....	28
Disobedience not forcible opposition to law,...	51	other cases alluded to,.....	30
District of Columbia, slave-trade not abol-		Furness, Rev. W. H.,.....	39
ished in,.....	75	Garnett, Henry, case of,.....	25
Divinity, Doctor of, for \$150,.....	96	Garnett and Pennington, Messrs.,.....	95, 96
Domestic slave-trade,.....	103	Garrett, R-becca, petition for freedom,....	81
Dominica,.....	99	General Assembly:	
Doughfaceism, its natural treatment,.....	38	in 1794,.....	61
Doughfaces, shall they always represent the		in 1815, 1816, 1818, 1846, 1849,.....	62
North,.....	186	General Assembly, New School,.....	58
Downfall of slavery, Jefferson on,.....	19	at Utica,.....	61
Dr. Durbin on the “Church North,”.....	56	General Assembly, Old School,.....	57
Dr. R. J. Breckenridge,.....	57	General Association of Illinois,.....	69
Duncan, Rev. W. C., on slavery,.....	84	German Anti-Slavery Society,.....	96
Durbin, Dr., letters to slaveholders,....	56	German newspaper in New-York,.....	89
Ecclesiastical bodies want watching,.....	56, 57	Gibson, Adam, case of,.....	25
<i>Edinburgh Review</i> on the cruising system,....	108	God, confidence in,.....	19
Effect and progress of truth,.....	107	Gospel emasculated,.....	65, 66
Eighteen years ago,.....	107	Gospel will subvert slavery,.....	66
Eighth commandment, note to,.....	61	Government must be divorced from slavery,....	107
Emancipation certain,.....	69	Governors <i>versus</i> Fugitive Bill,.....	44
Emancipation, West India,.....	18	Guadaloupe,.....	99
Emasculated gospel,.....	65, 96	Habess corpus, real and technical,.....	49
Immigration to Jamaica,.....	100		

	PAGE		PAGE
Haiti, Baptist mission at,.....	70	Methodist Church South,.....	42
Hall, Commissioner Charles M.,.....	26	Methodists, number of slaves owned by,....	56
Hamlet, James, case of,.....	24	Methodist Protestant Church,.....	42
Hebrew slavery, Beecher on,.....	7, 8	Methodist preachers of N. Y. and vicinity,...	40
Henry Clay and colonization,.....	71	Ministers, bad conduct of some,.....	39
Heyden of Germany,.....	96	fidelity of many,.....	39
Higher law discourses,.....	36-39	in favor of submission to fugitive law,....	32
Is, in harmony with U. S. Constitution, 103, 104		Missouri, severe laws against colored people, ..	74
sneered at,.....	50	Mormonism and slavery,.....	94, 95
History, light from, on U. S. Constitution,.....	104	Murder, what an orthodox minister calls,....	35
Home missionaries at the South,.....	64	"National Division" of S. of T.,.....	90
Home Missionary Society,.....	64	National Era on population,.....	87
Hopkins, Bishop,.....	35	Needed in West Indies, what,.....	98, 99
Hotham, Sir C.,.....	103	Never do wrong,.....	36
Hotspurs, no index,.....	83	New-England Baptists,.....	70
Illinois, resolutions passed in,.....	69	New German paper,.....	89
Importation of slaves into Brazil,.....	101	New-Mexico,.....	93
Imprisonment of colored seamen unconstitutional,	104	New-Orleans Courier on anti-slavery in N. O. ..	84
Imprisonment of seamen in southern ports,.....	77-80	New-York Evangelical Congregational Ass., ..	42
Improvement of people of color,.....	90	New-York Evangelist on caste among S. of T. ..	91
Increase of population, notes of,.....	87, 88	New-York Tribune and Colonization,.....	74
Indiana, persecution of abolitionists,.....	80	Niles, Ex-senator, on fugitive law,.....	50
Jackson, trampled on unconstitutional acts, ..	51	Norris vs. Newton,.....	80
Jamaica,.....	97	North Carolina, persecution in,.....	76, 77
Jay, John,.....	54	Northern men, what they should do,.....	107
Jay, John, an emancipationist,.....	106	Northern slaveholders,.....	85
Jefferson disregarded unconstitutional acts, ..	51	Northerners travelling south,.....	85
Jefferson on slavery,.....	83	No sympathy with disunion,.....	89
Jones, Thomas,.....	98	Number of slaveholders,.....	85
Journal of Commerce, feather in the cap of, ..	28	Objects of U. S. Constitution,.....	106
instance of cruelty from,.....	75	Officers American and Foreign A. S. S.,.....	113
Judge M'Lean,.....	50	Ohio Legislature on fugitive law,.....	45
Judge Sprague on Fugitive Law,.....	50	Old School Presbyterians,.....	57
Judson, Judge Andrew T.,.....	26	Old Testament and slavery,.....	111
Judges, U. S., volunteering to endure fugitive		Onesimus, case of,.....	12
law,.....	47	Ordinance of 1787,.....	54
Kamehameha,.....	100	Original principles, we have acted on, ..	89, 108
Kaw-Mendi mission,.....	69, 103	Ottawa, Ill., convention at,.....	69
Kentucky, new anti-slavery paper in,.....	88	Palmetto State, cruelty in,.....	75
Kidnapping under fugitive law,.....	51-53	Parker, Rev. Dr.,.....	35
King, Preston, and slavery in the District, ..	75	"Pawns" enslaved at Liberia,.....	72
Knibb, and West India slavery,.....	55	Pennsylvania, action of Legislature,.....	44
Knight and Hughes at Boston,.....	27	People, the great court of errors,.....	49
Krebs, Rev. Dr., on fugitive law,.....	34	People of color, improvement among,.....	90
"Ladies' Association" in Canada,.....	100	People of the North, what they may do,....	107
Lathrop, Rev. Dr., on fugitive law,.....	34	Perpetualism,.....	54
Law of 1793,.....	47	Perpetualists at the South,.....	85
Lawrence, Abbott, on Bible,.....	68	Persecution in Alabama,.....	77
Leavitt, Dr. O. S., and flax-cotton,.....	96	in Indiana,.....	80
Leavitt, Rev. W. S.,.....	38	in Iowa,.....	81
Liberia, Lieut. Forbes on,.....	72	in Maryland,.....	74
Liberty Almanac,.....	88	in Michigan,.....	80
Long, Henry, case of,.....	25	"Persevere,".....	108
Lord, Rev. Dr. J. C., on fugitive law,.....	34	Petition of Andover students,.....	70
Lowell, Mass., Baptist Convention at,.....	70	Philadelphia, declaration of sentiments at, ..	107
Lucy Ann, Capt. Hamilton,.....	100	Philemon, epistle to,.....	111
Lushington on fugitive law,.....	50	Plumer, Rev. Dr.,.....	58
Lynching of Elder Matthews,.....	77	Population statistics,.....	87, 88
M' Bride, Rev. Jesse,.....	77	Power of sympathy,.....	55
M'Clure, Rev. Mr.,.....	57	Preachers, cotton,.....	22
M'Grawville College,.....	70	"Preachers' meeting,".....	40
M'Lean, Judge, on unconstitutional laws, ..	40	Preachers, slaveholding, among Methodists, ..	41
Madison, Mr.,.....	105	Preamble U. S. Constitution,.....	106
Mammon, shall we worship it?.....	107	Presbyterians, New School,.....	58
Mann, Hon. Horace,.....	82	Old School,.....	57
Martinique,.....	99	slaves owned by,.....	56
Maryland expelling free blacks,.....	74	Press :	
suits for freedom,.....	81	open to anti-slavery intelligence and argu-	
verdict for Rebecca Garrett,.....	81	ment,.....	46, 89
Mason, Senator, about slave laws,.....	104	pro-slavery versus law of Vermont,.....	45
Mass: vessels engaged in slave-trade,.....	101	religious, its faithfulness,.....	38
Matthews, Rev. Edwards,.....	77	secular and religious,.....	45
Meade, Senator, on Virginia staples,.....	28	President United States:	
Meanness of a justice of peace in Ohio,.....	91	declaimed against slavery,.....	21
Medina, Ohio, convention at,.....	70	hesitated to sign fugitive law,.....	21
Meetings against Fugitive Bill,.....	41	proclamation in case of Shadrach,.....	28
Memorial to A. H. M. S.,.....	64	Preston King,.....	75
Merchants and manufacturers alarmed; what		Proclamation, President Fillmore's,.....	28
they did, and what they should do,....	29, 30	Progress among free colored people,.....	93
Methodist church, anti-slavery in,.....	41	Progress of anti-slavery in the South,.....	84
		Progress of the Age,.....	88
		Proscription on Harlem R. R. cars,.....	91

	PAGE		PAGE
Pro-slaveryism of politicians and divines,...	46	South:	
Protestant Methodist Church,.....	42	anti-slavery sentiment increasing,.....	83
Publications sent South,.....	88	measures for the recovery of fugitives,...	23
Quarterly meeting of Friends,.....	44	object in Fugitive Bill to humble the North	22
Railroad conductor,.....	46	Southern clergyman in <i>N. Y. Observer</i> ,...	75
Randolph, J., in favor of Ordinance of 1787,	83	Southern Perpetualists, their violence helps	
Reaction at the South,.....	85	anti-slavery,.....	85
Refugees in Canada, exemplary conduct of, 81, 112		<i>Southern Press</i> , The,.....	87
Religious press,.....	99	Spear, Rev. S. T.,.....	37
<i>Reporter, Anti-Slavery</i> , British,.....	97	Speeches at anniversary,.....	5, 15, 16
Rescue of Shadrach by colored people,.....	27	Spencer, Rev. Dr. I. S., on Fugitive Law,...	33
Resolutions adopted at annual meeting,.....	3, 4, 5	Spirit of U. S. Constitution <i>versus</i> slavery,...	106
Resolutions New School Gen. Ass.,.....	58	Sprague, Judge, on Fugitive law,.....	50
<i>Review, Edinburgh</i> ,.....	103	Spring, Rev. Dr.,.....	34
Richmond, Va., slave-trade in,.....	75	State Prison preferred to slavery,.....	82, 83
Righteousness exalteth a nation,.....	57	Stevens, Thaddeus, on Fugitive Law,.....	49
Rio de Janeiro,.....	101	Stevenson's denial of slave-breeding in Va.,	82
Rogers, Rev. W. M., on fugitive law,.....	35	Stiles, Rev. Mr., in General Assembly,.....	58
Runaway slaves, large rewards for,.....	86	Stocks not afraid of disunion,.....	32
St. Johns,.....	100	Storrs, Rev. R. S., jr.,.....	36
St. Kitts,.....	97	Story, Judge, on law of 1793,.....	47
St. Philip's Church, New-York,.....	90	Stuart, Prof.,.....	35
St. Thomas,.....	100	solicited by D. Webster,.....	39
St. Thomas's Church, Philadelphia,.....	90	Successful efforts in Maryland,.....	81, 82
St. Vincent,.....	97	Suicide of a slave,.....	83
Same obstacles in the way of abolitionists		Suits against abolitionists,.....	80
here as in England,.....	108	Sumner, encouragement from his election,...	109
Sandwich Islands,.....	100	Sword of Damocles,.....	51
Santa Cruz,.....	99	Sympathy, power of,.....	55
Sapping and mining,.....	65, 66	Tallmadge, father and son,.....	24
Seamen, colored, imprisoned at the South, 77, 80		Tappan, Judge, on Constitution,.....	47
Senator Meade on Virginia staples,.....	82	Taylor, Rev. Dr.,.....	35
Shadrach, case of,.....	27	Temperance, Sons of,.....	90
in U. S. Senate,.....	28	Thaddeus Stevens on Fugitive Law,.....	49
Sims, Thomas, case of,.....	28	Theological students taking anti-slavery	
Slave auction at Richmond, Va.,.....	71	ground,.....	70
Slave-breeding in Virginia,.....	82	Thompson, Rev. J. P.,.....	38
Slaves not contented,.....	83	Tracts for Southern circulation,.....	68
Slaves, Jefferson predicted the freedom of,...	19	Trenton, N. J., tragedy at,.....	30
Slaves fleeing from Maryland and Virginia,...	86	<i>Tribune</i> , N. Y., noble remarks of,.....	91
Slaveholders in the church,.....	56	Triumph of the cause,.....	109
Slaveholders most arrogant when cotton is		True Abolitionism, no affinity with infidelity	
high,.....	82	or anarchy,.....	89
Slaveholders, number of them,.....	85	Unconstitutional acts not binding,.....	50
Slaveholding practised by Northerners,....	85	Unconstitutionality of slaveholding measures	104
Slave power:		Unexpected fairness in Maryland,.....	81
has usurped the government,.....	106	Unhappy divisions,.....	108
its rapid strides,.....	70	"Union League,".....	21
its triumph in the compromise,.....	20	Union meeting,.....	21
shall it always rule,.....	106	Union Presbytery, Charleston, S. C.,.....	83
Slavery:		Union Safety Committee,.....	22
among different denominations,.....	56	Usurpation of Slave Power enormous,....	106
at Liberia,.....	72	Utah,.....	94
been extended,.....	54	Utica, General Assembly at,.....	61
church deeply implicated in,.....	56	Vermont, in the lead as usual,.....	44
connected with moral and religious int'r'sts		Virginia, a slave-breeding State,.....	82
diminishing in Maryland and Virginia,....	84	Convention,.....	86
expected to cease when U. S. const. adopt'd, 105		Voluntary emigration, abolitionists do not	
great question of the day,.....	19	oppose,.....	72
in New School General Assembly,.....	58	Ward, Rev. S. R., and Meadville theo. school,	46
in Old School General Assembly,.....	57, 58	Washington's Farewell Address,.....	31
Jefferson on,.....	83	Webster, Daniel, at Buffalo,.....	104
John Randolph on,.....	83	Beecher on,.....	13, 14
people especially responsible for,.....	56	his shameful apostasy,.....	94
Rev. W. C. Duncan on,.....	84	on opinions,.....	94
short-lived,.....	55	tergiversation of,.....	93
sustained by the church,.....	57	Wesleyans in North Carolina,.....	76
unanimously prohibited by California con-		Western Home and Foreign Missionary Ass'n	69
vention,.....	95	West India emancipation,.....	98
was expected soon to terminate,.....	105	What anti-slavery men might do,.....	89
will be subverted by the gospel,.....	66	What needed in the West Indies,.....	98, 99
will destroy them, or they it,.....	57	Whipple, Rev. Geo., remarks of,.....	112
Slave-trade:		White men and women in slavery,.....	76
African,.....	101	Who lays stumbling blocks,.....	90
domestic,.....	103	Who responsible for slavery,.....	56
in District of Columbia,.....	75	Whose opinions are facts,.....	94
will live as long as slavery,.....	102	Willis, Rev. Dr.,.....	15, 110
Smith, Hugh N., rejected resolution,.....	93	Williams, R. G., the late,.....	110
Smith, W. B. F., rejected resolution,.....	60	Wood, George,.....	109
Sons of Temperance, action of,.....	90	Word "slave" not in U. S. Constitution,....	104
"Sort of common law?".....	104	<i>Working Man's Gazette</i> ,.....	84
Soulé, Senator,.....	78	Zuille, John Jay,.....	92

EULOGY

ON THE HONORABLE

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,

DELIVERED MARCH 24, 1848,

AT THE REQUEST OF THE

STUDENTS OF DARTMOUTH COLLEGE.

BY NATHAN LORD, D. D., *PRESIDENT.*

HANOVER :

PRINTED AT THE DARTMOUTH PRESS.

1848.

EULOGY.

It is easy to enact a local pageant for political effect ; to exalt a military chieftain, or a public orator. A crowd can be assembled for any purpose ; to observe the tricks of a mountebank, or the execution of a criminal. Any thing that speaks sharply to the senses of men will move the masses as by an electric impulse, and sway them to the will of the practised operator. But when a great nation stops suddenly in its wild career, and bows itself before the God of nations ; when it confesses to him, as if struck by the remembrance of his majesty, and its own unworthiness, the cause of that effect is not magnetic, but moral. Something has touched not the nerves, but the heart.

The recent death of Mr. ADAMS awakened that moral sympathy. The emotion was profound and universal. But it was peculiar. It was not as when Washington died. Some can recollect that then the great heart suffered a momentary paralysis. Consternation fell upon us. But in the speedy reaction there was a universal gush of sorrow. The nation was dissolved and found its relief in floods of tears. The old men and children, the young men and maidens wept together. We buried him as a father, a deliverer, and turned away from his grave in an agony of mourning. The men and women of that age, who survive, weep still at the name of Washington. It was not because he was not great ; nor because the idea of his greatness was not, of itself, sufficient to have repressed that kind of sensibility. But it was because his greatness consisted in such a singular tempering of all the

qualities of a virtuous patriot, it seemed not to be greatness. It brought him down condescendingly to our level, to be one of us whom he had saved, and we thought not so much of his character, of his life or his death, as of our loss, and the world's loss. It was then, in the infant State, as it was once, in a partial instance, in the infant Church, when the brethren of the great Apostle fell upon his neck and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more.

But in respect to Mr. Adams it was not so. The nation, produced, as it were, and nourished, and set in its course by Washington, has grown up to lusty, independent manhood. Mr. Adams grew up with it. But he was a man in his childhood, and always kept himself above it, and before it. An illustrious father's experience and wisdom produced their natural effects in his opening mind, and gave him ability beyond his years and his generation. He always maintained his eminence by a corresponding discipline. He had our genius and spirit, our principles and sympathies, yet a wider comprehension than any of his cotemporaries, a more profound learning, and a more weighty authority. He bore successive offices of the State, and at length its Chief Magistracy, with extraordinary freedom and facility, and then was able—a marvellous anomaly in the history of great men—to descend from the height of power and honor, and to mingle, without loss of dignity, in the turmoil and wrangling of a popular assembly. There, the man of no party, and no clique, he stood on his own principles, and judged, on his own account, of all measures. He was always ready, direct, uncompromising and severe, contending equally with friends and foes, when they opposed themselves to his better knowledge and superior wisdom; yet submitting quietly as a child, when his voice could no more be heard. He was a monitor, a rebuker, a denouncer, or a prophet, just as the varying moods of an inconstant and noisy people aroused the energies or sensibilities of his quenchless soul. At the death of such a man we could not weep. Besides, we have grown too old, and stout, and wick-

ed to weep. Rather, we are astounded, afraid, and anxious. We look about us uneasily till the pressure of the visitation is relieved. We lament, but with a mingled feeling of remorse for our own errors, and of admiration at his exalted virtues. We pay him the tribute of our praise and our regrets; but wait, in the performance of his obsequies, only to go on more impetuously in our fatuous career, when the warnings and remonstrances of "the old man eloquent" are forgotten.

Forgotten, but not by all. It is true politically, as religiously, that in all periods of decline, there is a remnant, the men of true virtue, fewer, always, than we could wish, more, frequently, than we fear. By them, if we are not led back, in some favored crisis of affairs, to our first principles and affections, yet our catastrophe may be stayed. Therefore, the memory of Mr. Adams will be precious: and his influence, in minds that can appreciate and accept it, may be more effectual in his death than in his life.

The occasion does not require me to recite the course of Mr. Adams' life, or the circumstances of his death. Nor would it suit my purpose to review his political career. My object is not biography, or criticism. I leave these to the curious and the politicians. I have no care to detail incidents, or discuss measures. Other themes better become these halls. I am called to speak his eulogy; and I would search with you for those hidden elements of character from which his greatness, as by a course of natural vegetation, proceeded. I would commend to you some of the principles which lay at the foundation of his admitted excellence, by which also you may become like him benefactors of your country and of mankind. In a College, more than elsewhere, such an example should be recorded and remembered.

I. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." That great lesson of Inspiration was early invrought into the mind of Mr. Adams. It was the first lesson that his mother taught him. It was enforced by a mother's proper example and authority. Whoever would know the secret of his greatness must go back to the nursery where the Pastor's daughter be-

gan to form the great man of the State by the principles of the Church. The influence was like precious ointment upon his youthful head. Its savor was never lost. In his native fields, or in the city ; in domestic intercourse, or in foreign travel ; in the school, or the College ; in courtly circles, or the coteries of philosophers and statesmen ; in the engrossing pursuits of his profession, or the more distracting engagements of public office, from the clerkship to the Presidency ; and in the subsequent sturdy and angry conflicts of the political arena, the God of his Puritan mother was ever before him. He was guided by the Divine Word. That Word was made the test of all other learning. Through his long life a part of every morning was spent in the study of the Holy Scriptures, in different languages, with careful comparison, and serious inquiry ; and he walked, through every succeeding day, in the light of the everlasting Law.

But it would be injustice to Mr. Adams to describe him merely as a conscientious man. It is probable that he was conversant with the Scriptures mainly as a miraculous and plenary Revelation of God, republishing, with greater light and authority, the ancient oral Revelations, from which we have derived the system of Natural Religion. The religious statesman, from the nature of his studies, and of his necessary intercourse with men of the world, and especially from his practical concern with legislative and administrative government, is liable to tarry on this threshold of the Sanctuary. But Mr. Adams' mind was not formed exclusively upon such a model. He rejected all models. He passed the limits of sect, and had sympathy with all who accepted the supernatural truths of Revelation. He extended his fellowship wherever he felt the presence of heavenly sentiments and affections. He loved best to tarry and to be edified where he perceived the motions of a Divine life, according to the words of Jesus Christ. He seemed to aspire to that heaven whence Christ the Creator proceeded forth, where now he ever liveth to send down the Spirit of love to all believing and loving minds, and from which he will be revealed again in judgment.

These distinctively Christian elements evidently existed in his mind, though not productive of that well defined Theology, or that fervent affection, which are their natural product, and which might have been attained by him in different pursuits. Those who knew him most intimately could better speak of him in reference to that interior principle of faith which is best exhibited in the habits of private life. But this general effect of faith was evident; viz. that he overcame the world. He acted in opposition to evil, and in defence of good, during a long life, in which these antagonistic principles were in violent warfare in the world around him. We accept the proof of the new life of God produced by his Spirit, in the unfaltering disciple, who penitently bowed himself as a sinner before God, and looked for redemption only through Jesus Christ; in whom existed no taint of superstitious or rationalistic unbelief; who submitted his moral judgments and affections to the test of the Divine Word; who refused the enticement of Princes and Ambassadors to violate the Sabbath; to whose lips obscenity, falsehood and profaneness were unknown, even in circles where such vices would be no disparagement; who never took advantage of his personal or official influence to violate temperance, purity, or good faith; who was devout towards God, just, compassionate and forgiving towards men; and who desired earnestly a better state, where right knowledge and true virtue only could be found. Such a man might be seen mostly in the outer courts of God's temple; for there, as a civil officer, it would naturally befit him to find his place. But he must be supposed to know the way to the place of offering and intercession, to the mercy seat and the Shekinah. God did not see fit to honor him like those worthies of the ancient Theocracy, of more excellent faith, who dwelt in caves and deserts, or who wandered in sheepskins and goatskins, destitute, afflicted, tormented, of whom the world was not worthy. Rather, he was classed with those few righteous kings of Israel, who were raised up to chastise idolatry, and to vindicate the righteous government of God.

II. With the religious element is naturally associated the moral. The two tables are sent down together. Mr. Adams was distinguished for his integrity. In this respect it would be difficult to find his equal. But I use integrity, not in the popular sense of honesty, veracity, sincerity, although these terms were applicable to him in their full extent; but to signify entireness, soundness and proportion both of private and official character. Rightly trained in infancy and childhood, his moral instincts were true and unperverted. Consequently, as the social relations were gradually unfolded to him, the sense of responsibility became an active principle in his mind. He was born and educated at the right period for moral impression. Then, perhaps, more than ever before in history, man, his rights and duties; the State, its groundwork, constitution and forms, its laws, conditions and relations, were subjects of daily discussion. In the circles where he moved these subjects were attentively considered by men of as great wisdom, experience and virtue as have lived in this, or any other age, or nation, England alone excepted in the time of the Commonwealth. Under such influences he appreciated human life, the social state, and the importance of making the conduct of life subservient to its proper ends. He is understood to have been remarkable for his self-discipline to preserve a sound mind in a sound body. He observed the laws of life, and of the mind, on his individual responsibility, and out of regard to his family and the State. Whatever was necessary to qualify him for his duties he studied and carried into effect. He omitted no engagement belonging to any place or relation in which he was called to act, never weary, never absent, never behind his time. All this was his habit, settled as the use of his necessary food. It was continued, till the close of his life, not from the principle of ambition, but the sense of duty. He felt that any thing else would be wrong. And not merely from the sense of duty, but because the right was more agreeable than the wrong. It would have been no privilege to him to have received a dispensation. He was too much of a Puritan to desire indulgence.

The aim of Mr. Adams was to be right and wise ; right in his principles, and wise in his application of them ; in which consists all true morality. His standard and rule were God's Revelations. He could not, therefore, be cheated by sophistry, and he would not be seduced by temptation. Moral distinctions were as familiar to him, in idea, as light and darkness, and he could not be led practically to confound them. He rejected the code of honor, the rules of etiquette, and the maxims of policy. Chesterfield was his scorn, and Machiavelli his abhorrence. In this lay his strength. It raised him above chicanery and corruption. It separated him from sycophants and double-dealers. It quelled the fear of controversy or resistance. Strong in principle, he regarded not consequences otherwise than to provide against unnecessary evils. For the rest he cared not. He knew where was his last refuge, and that the eternal Rock could not be started from its foundations. He rejected that most wretched of all fallacies, that what is morally wrong may be politically right. He denounced the error and its abettors. He would not, for his life, have otherwise dishonored the Ruler of the world. He proved that a statesman may be just. That he sometimes erred cannot be doubted, for he had the common passions of our nature, ; but his errors were not from the want, but from an excess of virtue. They were such as are always likely to be corrected in the natural reaction of a virtuous mind. He could be impetuous and unyielding ; but he was not obstinate, or malignant. He could be impatient and angry. But he was not resentful. He loved the arena, for there were questions and conflicts on which great destinies depended ; and he could be terrible in the strife. But when it was over, he would leave results to the sovereign arbiter, and go away to refresh himself with the sports of children.

Mr. Adams' extraordinary sense of justice placed him in some attitudes of great dignity and sublimity which deserve the special notice of young men. His defence of the right of petition is probably the most exalted specimen of learned, independent and stirring eloquence in forensic history. He

held that right to be the citadel of civil and religious liberty. He cared not who claimed it, on what occasions, with what arguments, or in what spirit. They might be wise, or foolish; sane, or delirious; Christians, Jews, pagans, or infidels. They might intend union, or disorganization; life, or death; and their related measures might be in correspondence with their true, or false ideas. It was not material. The principle was sacred. It was vital. It was worth more than Church, or State. It was worth more than the universe. For, it was necessary to the true ends of life. It was fundamental to the being of society. There could be no universe without it. Wherefore it must be maintained, though the heavens fall. He threw himself, with his exhaustless stores and his mighty energies, into the deadly strife. He comprehended the whole scene, its difficulties, its dangers, and its results. It may be said that he went alone; for, who of all the great men about him had courage to take with him his advanced position, or who that dared, had ability to sustain with him the dreadful shock; for he went to battle against a crazed and exasperated nation. Day after day, year after year, the contest was prolonged. It was severe, sublime and terrible. The heavens thundered; lightnings glared; the earth shook; volcanoes belched out their glowing fragments; lofty towers toppled down; mountains were cast into the sea. Now we seem to lose him in the dust and smoke. His voice is drowned in the tumultuous din. Again his veteran form emerges. We see the gleaming of his steel. We hear the strokes of his thundering arm. His shout rises shrill above the fiery storm, "JUSTICE! JUSTICE! in the name of God, Justice and Liberty!" He conquers. He reclines upon his armor reeking, but not fainting, and utters his memorable acknowledgement of the Power that helped him, "Thank God, the seal is broken." Can we wonder, that when the conqueror at length fell, on the very scene of his victory, struck not by an earthly power, but by the hand of God, then the nation bowed its head?

The discussions of slavery, in the halls of Congress, which grew mainly out of the controversy on the right of petition, gave occasion to Mr. Adams to exhibit the same profound and unconquerable sense of justice and equity. Some of his passages, in this respect, are unequalled, except in his own biography. Had the Representatives of the nation calmly listened to their petitioners ; had they taken judicious measures to instruct the country, and quiet its agitations ; in the discussions which must have ensued, Mr. Adams would probably have been less impassioned, but even more earnest and impressive. It is ever to be regretted that his views and those of other distinguished men could not have been so drawn out, upon the most comprehensive and impartial survey of the whole field of inquiry. Then the strife would have been, mainly, where it ought to have been, in the Legislature. The investigation and criticism would have been profound, intelligent and awful ; the people would have waited with a subdued and impartial spirit ; the hopeless confusion of ideas, now existing, would have been prevented ; and the true issue would, by this time, have been put, which is now impossible, or too late, before the nation, and the world.

To what conclusions Mr. Adams would have come, in the course of such an inquiry, it is difficult to conjecture. As it was, the ground on which he stood is evident ; viz. the Natural Law, the Decalogue, and the Christian principles of reciprocity and benevolence. He tried the institution of slavery simply in the lights of essential and preceptive morality. In those lights he saw cause to condemn it as a moral evil. He desired to see it abolished, politically, because of its immorality ; yet not with the madness of an incendiary, the malignity of an atheist, or the destructive fury of a revolutionary sans culotte. He would not, in destroying slavery, have precipitated the related institutions of Church and State. It is true, that with his determined sense of justice, and in consistency with his defence of the right of petition, he might have found himself obliged, at length, to proceed to that extremity. He would not have chosen to die before his time ; but Sam-

son-like, if a maddened people had imprisoned him, and put out his eyes, when brought out for their sport between the pillars of the idolatrous temple, he would have been likely, by a desperate effort, to bury himself and the nation in a common ruin. But he was a Puritan, and not a Jacobin. He would not have denounced his country till his country had absolutely denied its God. And then he would have chosen to die with his country, rather than to live and revel, like a Jacobin, in anarchy and blood.

But if the discussions on slavery had proceeded as they ought, Mr. Adams might have taken, at length, a different position. For, though he did not seem to see it, the ground on which he stood was doubtful. Where he stood he was firm, erect, sublime. Admitting the correctness of his issue, his course was generous, and Christian. But the true issue is not, whether slavery, assumed to be a human institution, is contrary to justice and benevolence; or whether, being morally and politically bad, it ought to be abolished? But the issue has respect both to the basis of slavery and its character. It is whether slavery is not a positive institution of God, and whether, being a positive institution, it is not morally and politically bad, only as it is unrighteously or imprudently administered. That is the issue of slavery; viz. its *Jus Divinum*. We cannot safely proceed a step till we have gained a foothold by settling that original and fundamental question of the Divine Right. Otherwise we are bewildered in a hopeless labyrinth. Unhappily, that question has not found admittance to the legislative halls. It is forestalled before the people. It is hardly known in the institutions of learning. It is mainly excluded from the Church; or, both in Church and State, it is passed over without examination, or decided without adequate reference to the only legitimate authority. How could it be otherwise at a period when the Divine Right of any thing is almost an obsolete idea, and when the most essential and vital questions of Church and State are settled, just like polytechnics, upon the judgment of conceited reasoners, or idle dreamers, in lyceums, academies

and district schools, and not, before the only legitimate tribunals, upon the authority of God ?

The question of slavery takes us to the Bible, and not to nature. It is a question above the instincts, or induction, or speculation. And it takes us to the Bible to inquire, not at the Decalogue, or at Christ's new commandment, but God's municipal enactments. It is a question, not about the principles of natural and moral government, but its administration. It is a question, not of right and duty, but of crime and punishment ; not of tenure, but forfeiture ; not of the original relations of man to man, but the violent breaking up and sun-dering of those relations for the sins of men. It is a question, morally, about the Divine jealousy in visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children. And, politically, it is a question, not about the maxims of an uncertain and varying economy, but the necessary balance of a disordered system. It is not a question of capital, and trade, and labor, according to any superficial ordering of these distinctions ; but essentially, and morally, in reference to their groundwork and their true ends ; a question between order and insubordination, government and anarchy, life and death, in this upside down world of ours, till " the times of the Restitution." And because it is a question of simple Revelation, and such a question as it is, though we know not how Mr. Adams, upon a deeper study, would have decided it, it is a matter of extreme regret that a mind like his, so full of reverence for the Bible, and so able to extricate its meaning, on such a subject, should not have been drawn peremptorily to the inquiry.

I am aware that it would have been difficult for Mr. Adams, or any other American statesman, to approach that question without extreme embarrassment. For the nation had prejudged it. It had placed itself before the world, in the Declaration of Independence, on the fallacy of a *petitio principii*. It is true, the nation had taken back the assumption in the Constitution and Laws, and more practically, in the system of slavery. But that made the case no better, but worse. For, so we stood before the world with a falsehood in one hand, or

the other ; a fatal dilemma, which to statesmen, as well as to philosophers, is the most inconvenient of all positions. The Representatives of the nation could not have chosen to face an alternative so humiliating and severe. However, no man sooner than Mr. Adams would have submitted to that necessity, if naturally laid upon him ; for he was magnanimous. No man would have sooner corrected, if possible, the singular anomaly. Or, if it could not be absolutely corrected, and if the nation must stand false on one side or the other, no man would have been more careful to mitigate the evil, and avert the danger, by shifting the falsehood from the right hand to the left ; that is, by correcting his issue, and accepting the consequences, not of a treasured falsehood, but of an unintentional mistake.

The ground taken by Mr. Adams on the questions of China and Oregon is another evidence of his severe attachment to general principles, and his fearless defence of them, in disregard of political views, and the measures of party. That a nation ought not to separate itself from the fellowship of the nations, and refuse to bear its part in the work of life, is a principle of Natural Law, and of the Decalogue. It is practically necessary to the greatest good of mankind in general. By consequence, it is equally evident, that when this fundamental obligation is violated by any nation, upon whatever pretexts, the right of redress must exist somewhere. This right can be administered only according to God's ordinary method of chastising guilty nations ; viz. by war. The principle involved is of duty, crime, and punishment, without which the world as it is could not subsist. For this principle all States are founded by Divine authority, the bounds of their habitation are appointed, and the sword is put into their hand. In accordance with it God set up and administered the pattern State of the ancient Theocracy.

By equal reason it is evident that a State ought not to appropriate territory which it could not occupy, to the prejudice of other States, or any one of the family of States, which might be able to fulfil, or was in the course of fulfilling the Divine

injunction to "replenish the earth."—On these principles Mr. Adams took his stand. And his position, in point of principle, was not the less sound, because he had been led to it, as he was bold to profess, by the word of God.

Whether, in the one case, the right to compel China resided in Great Britain ; or, in the other, whether the United States had reasonable ground of controversy with England, in consistency with these principles, are wholly different questions. They are questions of policy, subject of course to judgment and opinion. They are to be settled mainly in the lights of civil and diplomatic history, and of political economy. In these lights Mr. Adams had walked intelligently for threescore years and ten. With such questions he had been more conversant, and had a better knowledge of them, than any other living man. Still, he might err. For, in the application of our principles, there may be sometimes doubts and difficulties which neither rectitude nor wisdom can satisfactorily overcome. In such cases, the accurate balancing of opposite probabilities, and the adjustment of conflicting evidence may depend more on temperament than virtue. In some conditions the soulless and bloodless politician may make a sounder inference, or a shrewder guess, than the highminded and earnest statesman, whose shoes' latchet he is not worthy to unloose. Mr. Adams' veins were sometimes very full.

I have chosen to put Mr. Adams in these lights, not because I would commend his views of these questions, as questions of policy, for I do not accept them ; but because they illustrate his strength of principle, and his manly independence. Confident in his own judgment he dared, in the one case, to stand against the general opinion of the civilized world ; and, in the other, to give seeming countenance to a government which had not his confidence ; a government, which he did not believe to be capable of maintaining its own decisions, and which, in its zeal to extend the domain of the country, would be likely to hasten its catastrophe.

In all these respects, the example of Mr. Adams is worthy of the especial consideration of young men, and now, more than

ever, the educated young men of our country. For, we live in an age when these virtues of our illustrious fathers are dying out ; an age which exalts the voice of the people above the voice of God, and which on all hands, and in all parties, concedes to public opinion what it refuses to the moral law.

III. The moral qualities of Mr. Adams were the natural foundation, as they were also the proper measure of his intellectual greatness. We deny that there can be the highest order of intellect without an active moral sense. For the intellectual power of the mind is physical, and it can have no true guidance but from a still higher and more authoritative physical power, the conscience. We deny, also, that the highest physical ability of any, or all the mental powers can exist without the moral life, the heavenly love, produced through the Gospel in the soul. Otherwise, the mind is an automaton, its discipline is mechanical, and its attainments are merely artistic, formal and superficial. Mind, in distinction from the heart, is as incapable of growth in its proper order, as the body without the principle of life. It may be enlarged artificially and mechanically, by accretion, but not by the natural process of developement. Or, if the moral essence is corrupted, then, equally, without a restored healthy activity, the developement of the intellect will be partial, disproportionate and unshapely. There are doubtless immoral men of great intellects. But they will not bear a dispassionate and searching criticism. They are great only in some things, and for some purposes. They are great, not for all, but for their party or sect, their patrons or retainers. They fail in those exigencies which require entireness, soundness and self-devotion. They are cast down when the selfish and partial interests which they serve are no longer ascendant. Or, they are great only while they live, or in the age which has felt the power of their fascination. Posterity tries them. The tinsel decays and drops off by time. The hidden fallacy works out. They are monuments, not of human greatness, but of human folly ; of folly on their own part, in seeking for excellence without virtue ; and on the world's part, in its be-

ing cheated, generation after generation, by such false lights that steam up from beneath to lure it to its ruin.

Such was not the greatness of Mr. Adams. Without doubt his mental powers were constitutionally of a high order, and well-proportioned. But he was not more excellent, in this respect, than many others. Had not his mother taught him, and had he not submitted his understanding daily and devoutly to the Bible, the difference between him and most other great men would not have been remarkable. As it was, he became greater, because he did not, like them, invert God's natural order, and put the intellect before the conscience and the heart. He began at the foundation. Consequently, his greatness was in essence, not in accident; in quality, not in measure; in spirit, not in form; in matter, not in manner; in conduct, not in management; in comprehension, truthfulness, and efficiency, not in arrangement, affectation, and finesse. But for his moral discipline he would have been a pedant, but not a scholar; a politician, but not a statesman; a skilful wire puller in the drama of his country, but not its master spirit, the embodiment of its genius, the representative of its vital principles. Others might have been as tall as he, but not as sturdy; more graceful, but less majestic; moving fantastically in the breeze, but upturned or shattered in the storm. Others could have trimmed the sails of the ship of State, but not like him controlled the helm; they could heave the lead, but not find the latitude; they could contribute to the gladness of the scene under sunny skies, or on peaceful waters, but only to its terrors in the whirlwind, and among the rocks. Mr. Adams' mind had magnitude, proportion, fullness, solidity and strength, the effect of growth, and not inflation. The moral life was in it; its aliment was righteous principle, and consequently it was ever vigorous and productive. The green leaf of the spring failed not before its time; its blossom died not unnaturally enforced; and he brought forth fruit an hundred fold in his old age; for his root drew nourishment from the depths. The root, the tree, the leaf, the fruit were full of sap when the lightning came. Whose mental stores like his,

so ample, so varied, so adjusted, so ready at command, so pertinent to all the exigencies of his private, or official life, so treasured up for the benefit of his successors, and the instruction of mankind ?

Was the characteristic of Mr. Adams' intellect genius ? No. Or talent ? No. Was it perception, penetration, judgment, fancy ? No. In any one of these he was equalled by other men who had unwisely stimulated some special faculty, or had made haste to be great by popular affectation. But it was all these naturally combined, and trained, proportionately, to the search of truth, in exact, severe and painful discipline. Did he become great by observation, by reading, by thought, by writing, by discourse ? Not by any one of these alone, but by the practical harmonizing of them all. For, who like him made all the senses inlets to the materials of knowledge ? Who like him gathered up not the floating, ephemeral and and trashy learning of the times, but the matured wisdom of the wise ? Who like him elaborated these treasured elements into systems of his own, by which the men of onesided and partial views, great though they were, were confounded through his earnest and unartificial eloquence ? Was he a man of theory, or of practice ? Was he a discoverer, an organizer, an administrator ? No one of these alone in separation from the others, or according to any mere ideal of these distinct classes of great men. For, though he could soar into imaginary worlds, he accepted nothing that would not stand experiment, nothing that suited not the actual states and conditions of society, or that did not consist with the Revelations of God. Do you ask for analysis ? He could sift. Or, for synthesis ? He could construct. Yet was he not a captious critic, nor a conceited architect. His mind, in this respect, was correctly shadowed by his style of private life. He was not envious to mar the palace of his ostentatious neighbor ; nor vain to excel him, though he might have done it, in the magnificence of his own dwelling. He was better suited with the venerable and well appointed, though plain and homely mansion of his fathers.

We could wish that the distinctively Christian element had been more active in the mind of Mr. Adams. It would have more exalted his faculties, and given them a higher direction for the good of others. But, as a statesman, he might then have been too far beyond his age. He had sufficient virtue to keep him above the atmosphere of mere worldly men, but not out of their sight. He was Christian enough to refuse the fashion and pageantry of this world, to abhor its thoughtlessness and frivolity, its loose maxims, and its vain pursuits; but not enough, by the absolute renouncing of the world, to fall off entirely from its regards. Had he lived in a great city he would have been thought a Stoic, or a Cynic, which he was not. But he would nevertheless have ruled the city, because, there, a Stoic or a Cynic is not so uncongenial, as the determined and consistent Christian. Less of the spirit of righteousness would have reduced him nearer to the level of the generality; more would have alienated their confidence. In either case he could not have led them, but would have lost their suffrage, and the country would not have enjoyed the benefit of his official labors. A monarch, if he willed, might be also a Prophet, or an Apostle. But, in a Democracy, no man, who is greatly above the moral sympathies of the people, can be a ruler, except in the time of rebuke and danger. Mr. Adams was as elevated in virtue as he could be without losing his position; and that he would have lost, as it was, but for his profound ability. Yet he was not what he was for the sake of his position, but because of Him who giveth to every man severally as he will. He was God's instrument to modify the evil tendencies of the declining State, not to accumulate the aggressive energy of Christianity, or exemplify its passive virtues. It would indeed be great glory to Christianity that such a man as Mr. Adams should be worthy of the faggot. But Christianity must not glory, when the world would suffer, out of measure, from the quenching of its great lights. The Church wants its confessors and martyrs. But the State must also have, occasionally, its righteous rul-

ers, or the bow of promise would be broken. God's wisdom is best.

To Mr. Adams the end of earth has come. The sage has uttered his wisdom ; the patriot has ended his labors. Centrally, between the stormy Capes of Massachusetts Bay, on the confines of the Old Colony, between Plymouth Rock and Bunker Hill, within a humble enclosure, the nation has laid the dust of its great statesman. He sleeps among his brethren, children of the Puritans, himself a Puritan, and the best civil representative that remained of a race of men, whose like has not been known in the annals of the world. He lived through the whole period of his nation's constitutional history. He contributed, more than any other man, to perpetuate its first principles, and to keep alive the genius of its institutions. He had a better comprehension of its relations, and a more profound sense of its interests. He left it the richest legacy of civil knowledge, the most illustrious example of patriotic virtue. He received its highest honors, living and dead. As his body is borne from the Capitol to his native village, the husbandmen in the fields stand still as the rushing cortege passes, and raise their hats from their heads.

Shall he live still in the life of his nation ? Shall the country of Washington and the Adamases be worthy of its greatest benefactors ? Shall the nation live ? Or, must it follow the law of the individual, "ashes to ashes, dust to dust ?" Who shall solve the problem of its prospective history ? What result of civil and religious liberty shall be written for a future age ? That problem will be solved speedily. Every thing for good or evil vegetates rapidly in a state of freedom. The results of popular liberty will soon be written. It requires now but a day to revolutionize a kingdom ; and but a few years for a liberated people to reveal what is in their hearts. A half century performs now, what was the work of a decade of centuries when man was held in by bit and bridle. The nations hasten to their destiny. What is that destiny ? Shall we ask of the past ? Shall we ask of the present ; not of the inventors, the politicians, the poets,

or the orators ; but of the statesmen and philosophers ? They have told us already. We know what such men said in 1793. We know what they said when the federal idea of our republic went out with the elder Adams. What would they tell us now ? the great men of England, Germany, France, and the old men of our own country ? What should we hear from De Tocqueville, Guizot, or from less interested observers, looking down from some height upon the Tuilleries, the Chamber of Deputies, or the Boulevards ? They would tell us that man reacts from superstition to fanaticism, from restraint and servitude to intoxication. They would tell us that the next chapter of the history of Christendom will be of anarchy ; that having learned our modern lesson of human perfectibility, speculatively and romantically, from the reason, and not from the Bible, we shall in due time learn its essential fallacy, practically and morally, from the Providence of God. But where is the point of rest between these extremes they know not. We must ask that question not of the State, but of the Church. We must ask it of a higher Oracle than man, of Theology, of Christ's Apocalypse. Do you say, we need not ask, for our country has tried the experiment ; it has solved the problem ; that here humanity is disenthralled, free, intelligent, successful and triumphant ? But what is humanity ? All history, past, present and future, is but a demonstration of humanity, of humanity sanctified on the one hand, unsanctified on the other, and these invisible families of good and evil proximately represented by the visible organizations of Church and State. Are Church and State, in our country, right, each in itself, and both in their reciprocal relations ? Have we attained to the true ideal ? Are we likely to attain it ? Are we blending the roses of all colors in one concentrated glorious white, the image of all truth and purity ? Are we becoming the true Theocracy, the end of promise ? Or, as man more affects self-government, does he not, practically, become more independent of the government of God ? Is not our modern idea of the social compact necessarily atheistic ? The demonstration is not yet complete. The history is not

yet written. Our country is still a problem. Who shall solve it? If you say, not the old men, then, I answer, the young men. I repeat emphatically, that is the practical lesson of the new generation. The responsibility is theirs. If they want it, God throws it on them, a greater than he ever laid on the shoulders of men. If any of our young men learn not that lesson truly and wisely, if they bear not that burden with the principles and spirit of their pilgrim fathers, let them never pass by the graveyard at Quincy, let them never find their way to the valley of the Potomac.

THE GOOD LAND IN WHICH WE LIVE.

▲

D I S C O U R S E

PREACHED AT CONCORD, N. H.,

ON THE DAY OF

PUBLIC THANKSGIVING,

NOVEMBER 28, 1850.

BY ^{Pastor} NATHANIEL BOUTON,

Pastor of the First Congregational Church in Concord.

CONCORD:

PRINTED BY MCFARLAND & JENKS, MAIN STREET.

1850.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Concord, Nov. 30, 1850.

Rev. N. Bouton :

DEAR SIR :—

The undersigned, members of your Society, having listened with much interest to the Discourse delivered by you on our late annual Thanksgiving Day, and believing that its publication will be productive of good at the present time, in its tendency to induce men to consider their obligations as citizens of the United States to support the Constitution and existing laws of the country, respectfully request a copy for publication. We remain, very truly,

Your Friends and Parishioners,

FRANCIS N. FISK,
SAMUEL COFFIN,
SAMUEL MORRIL,

RICHARD BRADLEY,
CHARLES MOODY,
ROBERT DAVIS.

To the Rev. Nathaniel Bouton :

DEAR SIR :—

The undersigned, citizens of Concord, though not members of your Society, having been present at the North Church this morning, and listened with great satisfaction and cordial approval to your able and patriotic Discourse upon our duty as citizens and Christians to stand by the Constitution and Union, and obey the laws of the country ;—believing, at this time of doubt and danger, when opinions so hostile to the Constitution and Union of these States ; so at war with all civil, religious and social organization, are publicly propagated, that the dissemination of the sentiments and arguments contained in that Discourse would have a tendency to correct the errors of the misguided friends of the Union, and to thwart the wicked purposes of its foes, as well as to strengthen the hands and encourage the hearts of the great and good men all over the country who are laboring in its defence ;—believing, too, that you have uttered the real sentiments of a large majority of the good people of this State—would respectfully ask the favor of a copy for publication.

JOSEPH ROBINSON,
ARTHUR FLETCHER,
JOSEPH LOW,
EPHRAIM HUTCHINS,
EDW. H. PARKER,

E. H. ROLLINS,
WM. P. HILL,
HENRY WOOD,
WILLIAM PRESCOTT.

Concord, Thanksgiving eve., Nov. 28, 1850.

NOTE BY THE AUTHOR.

As appears from the foregoing communications, this Discourse is submitted for publication in compliance with the request, both of members of his own Society, and of other highly respected citizens who heard it, of different political parties and religious denominations. In preparing a copy for the press, the author would state, that without altering a single sentiment, as first delivered, he has endeavored to give more logical precision to the Scripture argument for obedience to civil authority ; has added a paragraph to show the nature and certainty of the “**EXPLICIT AND SOLEMN COMPACT**” into which our fathers entered in adopting the Federal Constitution ; and has also appended several notes, to which he would respectfully ask the attention of his readers. The author’s desire and prayer is, that the sentiments herein expressed may serve to increase and cherish, in the hearts of all who may read them, that love of country and subjection to lawful authority, which, with love to God, constitute an essential element in the character of a Christian citizen.



DISCOURSE.

DEUT. 8 : 10.

WHEN THOU HAST EATEN AND ART FULL, THEN THOU SHALT BLESS THE LORD
THY GOD, FOR THE GOOD LAND WHICH HE HATH GIVEN THEE.

WE welcome, with grateful and joyous emotions, this annual festival of thanksgiving and praise. In the language of our chief magistrate, "we can rejoice that the circling seasons have again passed, rich and overflowing with the beneficence of Heaven to the people of this State ; that neither our unfaithfulness nor our ingratitude have dried up the fountains of God's goodness to us."

We are assembled in our usual place of worship, "reverently to offer up the homage of humble and grateful hearts to our Almighty Father and Benefactor, for his countless mercies and blessings." Among the particular subjects of thanksgiving recommended in the proclamation of our chief magistrate, we are invited to unite in fervent thanks to God, "for having given to us the pleasant and goodly land in which we live ; for the freedom, health, peace and prosperity he has permitted us to enjoy ; for the plenty with which he has filled our dwellings ; for our means of intellectual, moral and social advancement ; and for that crowning blessing, the revelation of mercy and of hope, the Christian Religion." As it is impossible to dwell at any length upon these several topics, it will, I trust, be deemed altogether appropriate to the occasion, to select as the chief theme of our grat-

itude, the first subject named—THE PLEASANT AND GOODLY LAND IN WHICH WE LIVE; especially as we may view it in connection with the “crowning blessing”—the glorious gospel of the Son of God.

I observe, then, *that the inspired description of the good land which God gave to his ancient people, fitly applies to our own country.* “The Lord thy God bringeth thee into a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains, and depths that spring out of the valleys and hills; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil-olive and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness, thou shalt not lack any thing in it; a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou shalt dig brass.” This beautiful land of Palestine was the gift of God to his covenant people. Though comparatively small in extent, it had its goodly mountains of Lebanon on the north; the rich and fertile valley of the Jordan running through its centre, to the Salt Sea in the south-east; on the west, its coast was washed by the Mediterranean Sea, by means of which it enjoyed a lucrative commerce with all adjacent and even distant nations; and the productions of its soil were rich in variety and abundance.

But all, and much more than all that can truly be said of Palestine, may be said of our own country. Survey its magnitude, grandeur, exuberance, resources, and population. Behold it extending the entire width of the continent, from ocean to ocean—stretching through twenty-five degrees of latitude, and twice that of longitude—all within the temperate zone, the most healthful portion of the globe, and best adapted to develop the physical and mental constitution of man. Look at its vast ranges of mountains; its long and mighty rivers; its inland seas; its beautiful and vast plains; its inexhaustible mines of coal, and iron, and copper; of lead, and silver, and gold. Look at the interminable forests of

most valuable wood ; at the exuberance and boundless variety in the productions of the soil ; with a commerce carried on within its boundaries and with all the nations of the earth, more numerous in ships, more enterprising in men, and more extensive, it is said, than that of any other nation under heaven. It may help to fill up what the imagination alone finds it difficult to conceive, to state in figures that, "exclusive of the late acquisitions from Mexico, the area of our country admits of division into 376 States as large as Massachusetts ; and, including the territories ceded by Mexico, the number of such States rises to 448. Three millions two hundred and fifty thousand square miles of territory form a broader field than 26 kingdoms like Great Britain could cover, and is exceeded only in 500.000 square miles by the whole continent of Europe."* Occupying this vast, beautiful, grand area of the earth's surface, is already a population of about 23.000.000, increasing at the rate of 800.000 souls a year, and destined, unless checked by some unknown and unforeseen cause, "to swell within a hundred years to a larger population than China boasts, and to double the number of all Europe."

This is the goodly and pleasant land which God hath given us. He gave the original deed and first occupancy to our pilgrim fathers, and to the founders of the other little colonies who settled on more southern shores. In his providence, he bade them go up and possess the land, and from one period to another, and by various means, he hath opened the way to obtain complete, undisputed and peaceable possession. The right indeed to this vast domain has sometimes been brought into debate. But without attempting to vindicate every particular acquisition of territory by purchase, by cession, or by conquest ; still, looking at the subject in its wide relations, it must, I think, be conceded that

* See statistical tables and estimates in Home Missionary, Nov., 1846, Oct., 1849.

God hath in his providence as truly given this land to us to possess, as he gave Palestine to ancient Israel. Hence, an important practical inquiry arises:—*What do we owe to this land as our common country?*

In attempting, my hearers, to answer this question, I wish to forestall any surmises or fears you may have, that your pastor is now going to enter the arena of political strife, to express crude opinions on matters that divide the people, or that he will adopt some party *Shibboleth*, and give offence to esteemed and valued friends. Rather, I purpose to avoid as much as possible all party and political allusions; to enter into a calm, dispassionate inquiry respecting what the Scriptures teach of the duties we owe to our country. A great question has arisen, which, by common consent, is designated "*Conscience and the Constitution.*" What relation subsists between them? To what duties does conscience bind us in respect of the constitution and laws of the land? And is there any "*higher law*" which exempts us from obedience to the latter? * These are grave and momentous questions; and, as you will all admit, fairly come within the province of a religious teacher, without subjecting him to the charge of meddling with party politics. They are questions, too, on which an interested community—yea, an inquiring and agitated nation—demands light. And surely it becomes every minister of the word, divested of all prejudice and party bias, to examine for himself the word of God, and give utterance to what he believes to be its divine and authoritative teachings.

I. I need hardly observe, in the first place, that we are bound to be grateful to God for all the blessings which we actually enjoy in the good land he hath given us. In the

* The author regrets that he has never had an opportunity to read the essay of Prof. Stuart on this subject, and is therefore entirely ignorant how far his own views coincide with those of the venerable Professor.

text this is a matter of divine injunction. "When thou hast eaten and art full, then shalt thou bless the Lord thy God, for the good land which he hath given thee."

Though there may be coëxistent evils which we deplore, yet the good demands our praise. We should, therefore, frequently, and especially on annual festive occasions like the present, review and enumerate our blessings. We are authorized to trace the line of our national descent backwards to the fathers and founders of our Republic; to make grateful mention of their christian virtues and of their heroic firmness in enduring privations of every kind, that they might plant the institutions of freedom, of learning, and religion, in this land which God gave them. We should refresh our memories with a rehearsal of scenes in which our own immediate ancestors took a part, when they freely pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor, and poured out their blood like water in their country's defence. We should recal the names of the brave, the wise, and the good, whom God raised up to be our leaders in the councils of the nation and in the fields of war. Sacred in our lips be the names of Washington, the Adamses, Hancocks, Franklins, Shermans, Jays, Hamiltons, and other worthies, who either put their hand to the great Instrument of Independence, or who maintained the Declaration with their fortunes and their blood. Contrasting our happy condition in this good land, with that of other nations—with the benighted and down-trodden subjects of despotic power in Asia and Africa; with the serfs of Russia; with the unenlightened and poverty-stricken tenants of Ireland; with the vassals of Spanish and Turkish domination; with the changing, convulsive and unintelligent liberty of France; with the religious tyranny, upheld by foreign bayonets, at Rome; or with the mixed freedom and oppression, wealth and poverty, protestantism and persecution, of England—we should thank God that he hath given us this good land in which to

dwell ; that here a government, administered by rulers of our own choice, spreads the broad shield of its protection over and around us, guarding and defending our persons, property, liberty and life ; that we enjoy, what no other people under the whole heaven enjoy in an equal degree, the liberty and right to worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences, without any wishing or daring to molest us ; that the means of a generous education are widely diffused ; that throughout our broad land the Holy Scriptures are disseminated and read ; churches are reared, which are every Sabbath filled with intelligent and devout worshippers ; and that from year to year a benignant Providence pours over our land the showers of plenty in such abundance that lean and famishing want is unknown, and the millions of our population have unceasing occasion for thanksgiving and praise. For these and ten thousand other blessings which we enjoy, should this goodly and pleasant land be every year and every day more and more endeared to us ; yes, to us—

“ Be this the land, of every land the pride ;
 Beloved of heaven, o’er all the world beside ;
 Where brighter suns dispense serener light,
 And milder moons emparadise the night ;
 A land of beauty, virtue, valor, truth,
 Time-tutored age, and love-exalted youth.
 The wandering mariner, whose eye explores
 The wealthiest isles, the most enchanting shores,
 Views not a realm so beautiful and fair,
 Nor breathes the spirit of a purer air.”

Then “ bless the Lord thy God, for the good land which he hath given thee.”

II. *It is a scriptural duty to pray for the rulers of our land.* Suffice it, on this topic, to cite the apostolic injunction : “ I exhort that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men : For kings, and for all that are in authority ; that we may lead a quiet and

peaceable life, in all godliness and honesty ; for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour." I Tim. 2: 1-3. When we reflect on the responsibilities which always, and at times with overwhelming weight, rest on the rulers of a great nation, the importance and necessity of prayer for them cannot be too much magnified. It is a positive Christian duty, binding on all the ministers and disciples of Christ ;—a duty which not only ensures the blessing of God on the rulers themselves, but also the peace, happiness and usefulness of all Christian men. Oh ! had more prayer been offered for our rulers, in the pulpit, at domestic altars, and in the closets of our land, during the late session of our national Congress, we cannot believe that such divided counsels would so long have prevailed ; that the hearts of our ablest statesmen had been oppressed with anxiety and fear for the safety and perpetuity of our union ;—perhaps the great heart of our heroic Chief Magistrate had not been crushed with the burden of the nation's care. Of all the affecting representations of the fathers of our country which the pencil of the painter has transmitted to us, I know of no one more so than the scene in the Convention at Philadelphia, that formed the Constitution of our Union ; when, in compliance with a resolution offered by Dr. Franklin, prayer was offered that they might be enlightened and guided in their deliberations by wisdom from above. There is Washington on his knees ; others, in like posture, by his side ; some recline ; some stand in solemn attitude, with face uplifted or covered ; while the minister of God lifts up his hands in devout and earnest supplication to the throne of mercy. From that day the business of the Convention proceeded with unwonted unanimity ! "*Pray, therefore, for all that are in authority.*"

III. I now observe, thirdly, our duty, no less than our true interest and happiness, requires that we *conform to the*

Constitution and obey the Laws of our land. As this, at the present time, seems to be the most important point in our discussion, let us endeavor to ascertain what the Scriptures teach on the subject of submission and obedience to civil authority ; what limits or exceptions, if any, they make : then we shall be able to apply the principles to our particular duty.

1. First, we are struck with the fact that in the whole life of our Saviour he carefully avoided all conflict with the existing civil authorities. He conformed to all the institutions and regulations of the government, though administered by cruel, oppressive, and eminently wicked men. The charge of being an enemy to Cæsar, and of aspiring to royal authority over the Jews, was false, as both Herod and Pontius Pilate themselves testified. To evince his regard and subjection to existing laws, he once even wrought a miracle to obtain tribute-money for himself and his disciple Peter. For so doing, he assigns this significant reason—“*Lest we should offend them.*” Matt. 17 : 27. On another occasion the Herodians—a crafty political party—attempted to ensnare him, and make him commit himself, in words, against the government. “Tell us,” said they, “what thinkest thou ? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or not ? Jesus said unto them, shew me the tribute money : and they brought unto him a *denarius*—a Roman penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription ? Whose *likeness* is this stamped on the coin ? And they said, Cæsar’s. Then saith he unto them, *Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.*” Here observe, the very question was a question of conscience ; and of the greater importance to them, because, as is believed, it had respect to a law of Moses, *that a stranger should not be set over the Jews as a king.** Is it *lawful* for us Jews to pay tribute to a foreign power ? Though

* See Deut. 17 : 15. Barnes’s Notes on Matt. 22 : 16—22.

conquered and held in subjection, must we not, in accordance with Moses's law, refuse tribute-money to Cæsar? Christ's answer, marked with superhuman wisdom, is, Cæsar has rights, to which you are bound in conscience to yield. Render, therefore, unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and at the same time render unto God the duties which you owe him.

2. Turn next to the injunctions of Paul, the apostle, Rom. 13: 1—7. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation"—or just punishment. The "higher powers" here spoken of, are *rulers*,—the constituted civil authority,—which is ordained of God in the sense that God authorizes, and in his providence institutes, civil government, as a means necessary for the well-being of men in society. "He is the minister of God to thee for good." v. 4. This is the true end and object of civil government. But on this passage let me cite to you the comment of Dr. Scott. "The higher powers," says he, "at Rome were not only heathen, but usurping, oppressive, and even persecuting governors; and Nero, who was then emperor, was a monster of cruelty, caprice and wickedness, almost unparalleled in the annals of mankind; yet no exceptions were made on that account. Christians were required to look above such concerns, and to consider God as the source of all authority, and civil society as *his* appointment for the benefit of mankind. It was therefore incumbent on Christians to render a prompt and quiet obedience to those governors under whom their lot was cast; patiently submitting to the hardships, and thankfully receiving the benefits thence resulting, without objecting to the vices of the constitution, the administration, or the rulers, as an excuse for refusing subjection."

Having thus asserted that civil government is an ordinance of God, for the welfare of mankind, the apostle urges obedience to it on the ground of *conscience*, and not simply through fear of punishment: "Wherefore, ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but for CONSCIENCE sake." v. 5. That is, as a matter of conscience, or of *duty to God*, because civil government is *his* ordinance.* Hear again this same apostle, addressing Titus, bishop of the church in Crete: "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." This is an essential part of a bishop's or minister's office;—to inculcate obedience to every class of civil rulers. *Titus* 3: 1.

3. The apostle Peter places subjection to civil authority on precisely the same ground. Writing to Christians scattered over different provinces of the Roman Empire, he says, *I. Pet.* 2: 13: "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man *for the Lord's sake*: whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." In thus submitting "to every ordinance of man," they were to have regard to the influence of their example: "For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." v. 15. Let your conduct as citizens of the State—peaceful, and obedient to the laws—adorn the religion which you profess.

Now, viewing the above passages as they stand by themselves, they seem to leave no room for disobedience or resistance to *any human law*. They make no exception in any case, but with absolute authority, as the will and command of God, they enjoin—"Let every soul be subject to the higher powers." "Submit to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake." While these passages thus in unqualified terms urge obedience to civil government as an ordinance of God,

* See Barnes's comment on *Rom.* 13: 1—7.

and the Saviour in his life exemplified the same, it further demands consideration, that the Scriptures contain no hint or caution that possibly we may carry that obedience too far. On the contrary, the frequent repetition of commands on this subject imply that we are in special danger of sinning against God, by disobedience to civil authority, and even by disrespect. "Curse not the king; no, *not in thy thought*." "Thou shalt not *revile* nor *curse* the ruler of thy people." "The man that will not hearken unto the judge shall die." See Eccl. 10 : 20. Ex. 22 : 28. Deut. 17 : 12. In the day's of Israel's degeneracy, "they would not hearken to their judges." Judges 2 : 17. So conscientious was the apostle Paul on this subject, that he made a public apology for speaking in a reproachful manner, *even inadvertently*, of one invested with civil authority. Acts 23 : 5. And let it ever be borne in mind, that in the long, dark catalogue of human offences, *the sin of obeying magistrates* is never mentioned, while that of despising and resisting is ranked among the worst of crimes! See II. Pet. 2 : 10. Jude, v, 8.

The question then arises, are there no limits and no exceptions to the duty of subjection to civil authority? I answer, there are; and they are contained, not in *commands* of God, but in the approved examples of good men, in at least three instances.

The first is the noble example of the three Jewish brethren in Babylon, who refused to bow down and worship the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar had set up; and who, when threatened for refusal, that they should be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace, replied to the king:—"O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O King. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up." Dan. 3 :

8—18. Similar was the example of Daniel, when prohibited by royal edict from offering prayer to Israel's God for the space of thirty days, on penalty of being cast into the den of lions. "When Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house ; and his windows being opened in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." Dan. 6 : 4—10. And he did right, for the law was a direct and designed infringement of his personal duties to God. We have, further, the example of the two apostles, Peter and John, who, after they had received commission and authority from their Saviour, were commanded by the Jewish Sanhedrim "not to speak at all, nor to teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye ; for we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." Acts 4 : 18—20. Here, you observe, are direct and palpable violations, by human edicts, of the rights of conscience in regard to the worship of God and the preaching of the gospel. To have yielded to them, would have been sin against God ; and were any *similar* cases ever to occur any where in the wide extent of our country, duty to God would demand instant refusal to obey. Happily we are in no danger, for this freedom of conscience in respect of the worship of God is expressly secured to us, both in the Constitution of our own State and that of the United States. The language of the latter is, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Thus far, therefore, the Scriptures are a plain guide. They do, by examples, warrant disobedience to civil authority, when the laws thereof come in direct conflict with the commands of God, in respect of the worship due to him. Observe, however, they are examples, not of *personal resistance* or *violence*, but of passive suffering ;—preferring to en-

dure the penalty of the laws, rather than disobey an express command of God.

On the same principles, it may be admitted that government has no right to require its subjects to commit murder, robbery, or violate any other *explicit command* of God. But who would dare intimate that we are in danger of being coerced into such sins, under a constitutional government, one object of which is to prevent and punish them? It is safe further to admit, that when human laws become intolerably oppressive upon the whole or a major part of the people, resistance, *even to revolution*, is justifiable ;—as our fathers resisted oppressive laws, and gained their independence. But let no one quote the above scriptural examples, to justify opposition to the government in the exercise of its constitutional authority, and in reference to the civil and municipal affairs of the State.*

* Mr. Barnes sums up his views on Rom. 13 : 1-7, with the following just and judicious remarks :

“ On the subject discussed in these seven verses, the following *principles* seem to be settled by the authority of the Bible, and are now understood : 1. That government is essential, and its necessity is recognized by God, and it is arranged in his providence. God has never been the patron of anarchy and disorder. 2. Civil rulers are dependent on God. He has the entire control of them, and can set them up or put them down when he pleases. 3. The authority of God is superior to that of civil rulers. They have no right to make enactments which interfere with *his* authority. 4. It is not the business of civil rulers to regulate or control religion. That is a distinct department, with which they have no concern, except to protect it. 5. The rights of all men are to be preserved. Men are to be allowed to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and to be protected in those rights, provided they do not violate the peace and order of the community. 6. Civil rulers have no right to persecute christians, or to attempt to secure conformity to their views by force. The conscience cannot be compelled, and in the affairs of religion man must be left free.”

Mr. Barnes further says : “ It is matter of devout thanksgiving that the subject is now settled, and the principle is now understood. In our own land there exists the happy and bright illustration of the true principle on

I say, therefore, notwithstanding these admitted exceptions to the general law of obedience to civil authority, yet we, above all people, have reason to conform to our own Constitution and Laws. For surely if Christians in the primitive age were required to obey the existing civil authorities—governments administered by such men as Caligula, Nero and Domitian; tyrants who ruled with arbitrary sway—what language can adequately express the duty of subjection to our own government?—a government established by our fathers in good faith and solemn compact;—adopted as our own, and administered by rulers of our own deliberate choice! To oppose, to refuse to submit to our own Constitution and Laws, is virtually to raise the standard of rebellion against ourselves; to repudiate our own acts; to annul our own covenants; to draw down on our own heads all the pains and penalties we have authorized against the disobedient and rebellious. It is to raze the foundations of the temple of freedom, and tear down the glorious superstructure which our fathers reared and cemented with their blood.

Listen to the simple but sublime declaration prefixed to the articles of our glorious Constitution:—"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do

this great subject. The rights of conscience are regarded, and the laws peacefully obeyed. The civil ruler understands his province, and Christians yield a cheerful and cordial obedience to the laws. The Church and State move on in their own spheres, united only in the purpose to make men happy and good; and divided only as they relate to different departments, and contemplate, the one, the rights of civil society; the other, the interests of eternity. * * Thanks should be rendered without ceasing to the God of our fathers, for the wondrous train of events by which this contest has been conducted to its issue; and for the clear and full understanding which we now have of the different departments pertaining to church and state."

ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." Every word is worthy of being written in letters of gold and spread out on the canopy of the skies, to be read and rejoiced in by a nation of free, grateful and obedient subjects. It is *your own* declaration; it is *mine*; it was our fathers', "by explicit and solemn compact." God grant that it may be our children's and children's children to the latest generation!

I beg leave to add that we, citizens of New-Hampshire, should be the last in the nation to violate this Constitution of our country; for this was the State which completed the number necessary to carry the glorious instrument into effect, and to set the wheels of the new government in motion.* Here—in this town—in yonder ancient edifice, it was adopted in a Convention of the people, 21 June, 1788. When they had gone over the Constitution, and debated it article by article, and adopted the whole, then, in the name of the State of New-Hampshire, they say: "The Convention having impartially discussed and freely considered the Constitution of the United States of America, reported to Congress by the Convention of Delegates from the United States of America, and submitted to us by a resolution of the General Court of said State, passed the 14th December, last past; and acknowledging with grateful hearts the goodness of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, in affording the people of the United States, in the course of his providence, an opportunity, deliberately and peaceably, without fraud or surprise, of entering into an **EXPLICIT AND SOLEMN COMPACT** with each other, by assenting to and ratifying a new Constitution, in order 'to form a more perfect union, establish justice,' &c., *do, in the name and in behalf of the people of said State of New-Hampshire, assent to and ratify the said*

* The Convention was held (by adjournment from Exeter,) in the Old North Church. "This was the *ninth* State in the Union which accepted the Constitution, and thus the number was completed which was necessary to put in motion the political machine."—*Belknap's Hist. N. H.*

Constitution of the United States of America.”* Thus stands the “*explicit and solemn compact*” of our fathers! What son of New-Hampshire will accuse them of *sinning against God* in making it, or allege that we are guilty in keeping it?

At this point the reflection forces itself on us, What a wonderful instrument this Constitution of our Union is! What wisdom pervades every article! Going into operation, at first, with only *nine* States, it has been found, after a trial of more than sixty years, to be adapted equally to all the enlarged and changing circumstances of our country, so that now it extends the broad shield of its protection over *thirty-one* States of the Union. Though nothing human can be called perfect, yet this seems so nearly so as to awaken our profound admiration for the wisdom that dictated it, and our thanksgiving to God for the innumerable blessings which, under his providence, it has insured to our country!

It is, however, now said, that somewhere among the articles of that Constitution is one that contravenes the rights of conscience; at least, asserts and enjoins a duty which we cannot discharge. The suspicion is not for a moment to be entertained; it could have no such aim; it cannot be. If there is an article that seems to have such a bearing, we must conclude that we put a wrong construction on it, or that we have raised a question of conscience, in opposition to *it*, rather than that *it* intentionally infringes conscience; for one express object of the Constitution is to guard the rights of conscience. True, there is an article in the great Instrument, which was introduced as a part of the compromise on which the union of the people of the United States was formed, and without which we should probably to this day have been a separated, broken, distracted—yea, a hostile and warring people;—and without which, too, if now blotted out or trampled down by a part, and against the consent

* See Original Records, in Secretary of State's office.

and remonstrances of the rest, would inevitably lead to a dismemberment of our Union, and a defeat of all the glorious ends proposed to be secured by it.*

Although, therefore, as an individual you may not approve that particular article, have you any right, before God, violently to oppose or resist it? Is "the explicit and solemn compact" to be broken at your will? Let that *conscience* which God himself addresses, when he commands obedience to every ordinance of man, utter its loud tones of admonition, that you touch not with violent hand that great instrument—the bulwark of our union, our defence, our liberty, our glory.

But yet, again, it is said, that in carrying out the provisions of that article, in a law of the land, duties are prescribed and penalties threatened, at which every generous, humane and moral instinct of our nature recoils. It may be so; and if so, deeply are the requirements of the law to be deplored. But were they meant by the framers of the law—our own chosen representatives, in whom the legislative power is vested—thus to wound any man's feelings? to trench upon any one's humane or moral sensibilities? or to enjoin a duty with which any individual's conscience had a cause to interfere? I cannot believe it—much as I may and do regret the apparent severity of the law. The effect ascribed to it must grow out of some misconception either of the nature or necessity of the law.† For, as I understand

* The Article referred to, is Art. 4, § 2. "No person held to service or labor in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service is due."

† It deserves consideration, that the language of the Constitution, on which this Law is founded, is such, that were slavery abolished this year, in every State of the Union, it would still need to remain, unchanged, in reference to other classes of persons, who are held to service by indentures for a term of years. In the debate in the N. H. Convention that adopted

it, with the exception of a change in some of its provisions, to render it more effectual, it is the same law that has stood on the statute book of the nation *fifty-seven years* ; that was signed by the hand of the immortal Washington himself ; that has been pronounced by the highest judicial authorities of the land to be in accordance with the sacred purposes of the Constitution, and not in a single respect to contravene it. It is now generally conceded that the late law suspends no *habeas corpus* act ; sets not aside *the right of trial by jury* ;* and, properly understood, interferes not with any of the offices of humanity, except as they may throw obstacles in the way of the execution of the law by legal officers. Nor does it require any *personal* act to be done, by any *private* citizen, directly to execute it, except in the last extreme, when worse comes to worse, and the officers of the law must be sustained by the mass of the citizens, or REBELLION triumph.

Here let me enquire by what right you charge upon any law of your country that it is unjust, oppressive and unrighteous ? that it conflicts with your duty to God or to man, and therefore may and ought to be disobeyed ? Have you no trust in the rulers of your own election, that they will act according to their oath, and enact only such laws as accord with the benign ends of our government ? Is there not a high judicial tribunal to which such questions are to be referred ? Is it safe or *right* in a private citizen to assume so vast a responsibility as to condemn the laws of his country, and at his will disobey them ? May every one set his *private* judgment above the legislative, executive and judicial authority of the land ? Reflect for a moment on the necessary consequence of adopting such a principle. You assume to

the Federal Constitution, there is no evidence in the records that a single objection was made to the 2d section of the 4th Article.

* It is well known that trials for freedom, by jury, are common in the courts at the South, and, when there is any legal claim, it is as likely to be gained as anywhere else.

pronounce upon every law, and to obey or disobey, according as you judge it right or wrong, irrespective of the judgments of your lawful rulers ; and you regard yourself at liberty to nullify and violate every human law which does not accord with your private judgment. You claim to be governed by some "higher law." What is that law ? How revealed to you in distinction from others ? Is it a voice from God, so plain as not to be misunderstood ? Rather, are you not quite as likely to err in regard to it as others ? But, if you are right in this position, then certainly every other individual may assume the same ; and when one law regulates the use or descent of property ; another, the degrees of consanguinity in marriage ; another, the business of trade, by license or tariff ; another, imposes penalties for crime ; and another establishes police regulations for the common good ;—then, if such law conflicts with your or my private judgment or conscience in regard to that matter, you and I are therefore exempt from obligation to obey that law. And following still the "higher law," possibly of my own selfishness, or pride, or obstinacy, I trample under my feet the law of civil society, which as a citizen I am already sworn to support. Then it cometh to pass, that each man is a law unto himself, and, like Israel in the days of deepest degeneracy and corruption, without priest or judge, "every one does that which is right in his own eyes." Where now, I ask, is the authority of God, which has ordained civil society and government, of which you and I are subjects ? Where is the obligation which he himself has imposed on us in this relation ? What becomes of *any* subjection for conscience's sake ? Where is the christian example of submitting to every ordinance of man "for the Lord's sake ?"

It has indeed been plausibly suggested that to inculcate obedience to the "higher law," i. e., to what *our conscience* deems right, in all cases, would supersede human enactments, and would itself ensure all the good ends of government.

But who, in such a world as this, would dare try it? On what nation or what selected number of individuals could the experiment safely be made? If two of them differed on any point, and that difference lead to conflict, who should decide between them? After all, you say, I must follow my conscience. I do not object to your decision, but you must not expect a martyr's crown unless you are sure, infallibly sure, you are right, and the event shall so confirm it.*

* Among those who on conscientious grounds are opposed to the recent Law of Congress respecting the return of fugitives from service, I recognize men—some of my own brethren in the church and ministry—for whom I entertain a high esteem and sincere affection. With them I agree in deeply regretting the original necessity of such an article in our Constitution, and such a law to carry it out. But I cannot agree with them that *duty to God* binds me to oppose, revile, denounce or resist the law. Rather, *duty to God*, as a subject of civil government, obliges me to submit. I know it is said that the law is contrary to the express command of God, in Deut. 23 : 15, 16. “Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee : He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best : thou shalt not oppress him.” My reasons for not considering myself obliged by this law to disobey the law of my own country in regard to the class of persons spoken of, are, 1. That the law in Deut., in my judgment, had respect to *foreign* servants, fugitives from *heathen* tribes, to whom the Israelites were under no obligations; and the retaining of servants from such could not therefore be reasonably complained of, much less their return lawfully demanded. 2. That the law, though humane and excellent in itself, was not designed to be necessarily of universal obligation, any more than some others of the Mosaic institutes, which are generally admitted not to be binding on us. For example, the law in verses 19 and 20 of the same chapter, respecting usury, with many others, in Chapters XIX, XX, XXI, XXIII, XXIV and XXV. See, also, Dr. Scott's comment on Deut. 23 : 15, 16.

I am also aware that it is said our law is repugnant to the command, “*Love thy neighbor as thyself.*” “Do unto others as ye would they should do to you.” The proper answer I conceive to be, that the manner in which love to our neighbor is manifested, must always be modified by our relations to society. The judge that condemns a criminal to die, and the sheriff that executes the sentence, must entertain no *personal* ill-will, but their love to the individual criminal must not lead them to disregard their higher obligations to the State. So my love to a fugitive from service must be

Still it is said by one and another, 'That law I can never approve :—that law I can never voluntarily aid to execute.' Doubtless, as a private citizen, you have a right to say thus much. Yea, more : if on mature reflection, investigation and prayer, your judgment is adverse to the law, you have an unquestionable right, secured by the Constitution itself, to seek to change or repeal it. You have liberty of speech, to express in becoming terms your convictions ; liberty to petition the proper authorities for a repeal ; liberty to vote for men who accord with your views, and who, as far as in them lies, will carry them out. You have still greater liberty—viz. : to seek in a constitutional way to have the Constitution itself amended. But, if after all your efforts, a majority of your fellow-citizens throughout the wide Union have no scruples of conscience in sympathy with you ; if they, under all the circumstances of the case, think the law not only necessary, but equitable and just, though repulsive to their humane feelings ; and if they, as under oath to God, are resolved to abide by "*the explicit and solemn compact*" into which they have entered to sustain the Constitution as it is ; then I say your duty as a citizen is also plain. *Conscience towards God demands that you peaceably submit to the execution of the law by the proper authorities.* If you do this at a sacrifice, you must patiently endure it. But you may not lift up the hand of rebellion ; you may not strike a blow at the Constitution—which is at once the charter of all our civil blessings ; the guarantee of our liberties ; the anchor of our national hopes. I entreat, I warn you, by all that is sacred in the name of conscience and religion, commit not such a more than parricidal deed against your

regulated by a consideration of the effect which my conduct towards him is to have upon the peace and welfare of the whole country. If doing him good in a particular way ; i. e., aiding his escape, contrary to the law of the land, should lead, as a probable or necessary result, to CIVIL WAR ; then surely I should forbear to show my love in that way. I respectfully submit these views to the sober reflection of all conscientious and candid men.

country. "Submit to this ordinance of man for the Lord's sake"—until by lawful means you can secure its repeal or amendment.

IV. I am now prepared to say, briefly, in the last place, *We ought to seek, by all lawful and moral means, to remove existing evils from the good land in which we live, and to perpetuate our national union and prosperity.* We justly deplore the existence of Slavery, as the chief source of our country's dishonor, disquiet and danger. In honest and truthful, but not *denunciatory* tones, should we utter our convictions against it, as a grievous moral wrong, and a blot on the fair escutcheon of our liberty. We may labor, by argument and persuasion, to induce our brethren in the States where it exists, to abolish the system by law—as they only have the right and power to do. Through our representatives in the National Legislature, we may seek to guard against the extension of the evil, and hem it in with a wall of freedom which it can never pass. We may pray the God of heaven, in his wise and far-reaching providence, to interpose and set the oppressed free, in such way and time as his infinite wisdom alone can see best; but we may not and must not, as citizens of a common country, bound to each other by "explicit and solemn compact," threaten, on this account, to break the bands of our union, nor exasperate our brethren, either by words or overt acts, to seek that terrible issue of sectional agitation and dissension.

Have I then, it is asked, become the apologist of Slavery? Do I seek to lessen in the public mind the enormities of the evil? And is it not a glaring inconsistency to profess to be the enemy of slavery, and to pray for its removal, and yet defend the Constitution and laws which uphold it? No, no.*

* The author professes to be, sincerely and on principle, opposed to Slavery, wherever it exists. But he has yet to learn that it is his duty on that account, to cease to preach, on apostolic authority, obedience to civil government; or to offer prayer for rulers, or for the oppressed and enslaved. The

But situated as we are ; citizens of a common country, under a Constitution which we have covenanted with one another to abide by ; our duty as well as true happiness lies in maintaining its provisions, until such time as they can be lawfully changed. I stand on the word of God and on the Constitution of my country, and on that two-fold platform use all lawful and moral means in my power to remove the *only*—certainly the *chief*—evil that afflicts us. But if I go against the Constitution and laws of the land, to remove or overthrow this evil, then one or the other of these alternatives, it seems to me, must follow : Either we must become involved in all the horrors of a civil war, in which, if slavery is terminated, it must be in the commingled blood of both the enslaved and free ; or else a southern and hostile Confederacy will be formed, in which slavery itself, as an institution, must be made perpetual ! From either of which alternatives we may well pray, “ *Good Lord, deliver us.*”

But there are other, almost innumerable *social* evils, which love to our country should prompt us to remove. There is Intemperance, with its retinue of vices, crimes and woes. There is profaneness, and Sabbath-breaking, and licentiousness. There is a sickly and sentimental **PHILANTHROPY**, which, virtually setting aside the authority of both human and divine laws, seeks to advance the welfare of mankind by modes of its own devising ; and, under the plausible names of “ *brotherhoods*” and “ *fraternities*”, acts on principles adverse to all penal enactments, and “ *despises governments.*” Then there is springing up in our cities, and thence spreading out into villages and country, a bold and blasphemous infidelity, which denies the inspiration and supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith and practice, and substitutes therefor its own violent impulses or

less we can personally do for their liberation, the more earnestly should we supplicate God’s grace, to dispose those who hold them in bondage, “ *to break every yoke, and to let the oppressed go free.*”

infatuated reasonings—dignifying these with the appellation of “*the higher law.*”^{*} To meet and overcome these and other evils of our goodly and pleasant land, we have a great duty to perform as citizens, patriots and Christians. Let the minds of the people be called back to the foundation-principles of LIBERTY and LAW, EDUCATION and RELIGION, on which the superstructure of our country’s glory has been reared. Let the means of instruction be coëxtensive with our expanded population. Let a pure Christianity be maintained by our firesides, and be sent abroad as the only conservative and restorative influence that can secure and perpetuate our blood-bought privileges. Let the hearts of all men, without distinction of party or denomination, of State or territory ; all who desire the lasting happiness and honor of their country ; pledge themselves anew upon their country’s Constitution ; and let them invoke by fervent prayer the blessings of our fathers’ God to abide with us.

I would appeal, on this behalf, to all the ministers of religion, never to assume the strange, anti-apostolic and anti-christian position of teaching, or any way countenancing insubordination to the “powers ordained of God,” any more than they cease to “plead for the oppressed,” and to “open their mouth for the dumb.”[†] To the youth of our land I would say, in the language of Jefferson, “Be just, be true ;

^{*} In a *Sermon on Conscience*, recently published by Theodore Parker, of Boston, who openly denies the inspiration and authority of the Holy Scriptures, he justifies a juror in violating his oath to clear a man acknowledged to be guilty of violating a law of his country. “If I value my manhood, I shall answer, after my natural duty to love a man and not hate him, and shall say, ‘not guilty,’ and I think *human nature* will justify the verdict.” Again in the same Discourse he says : “The man who attacks me to reduce me to slavery, in that moment of attack alienates his right to life ; and if I were the fugitive, and could escape in no other way, I would kill him with as little compunction as I would drive a musquito from my face.”

[†] Since the delivery of this Discourse, a printed “Sermon for the Times,” by Rev. A. Woodbury, of Concord, has been put into my hands. I have

fear God, honor your parents, and LOVE YOUR COUNTRY MORE THAN LIFE." I entreat the aged fathers and mothers, whose recollections go back to the early days of the Republic, to rehearse the scenes of their childhood and the traditions of their fathers in the ears of the rising generation, and thus extend and perpetuate the hallowed memories of those who lived, and suffered, and died for their country. I would that such examples be multiplied, as one that has recently occurred* in a neighboring State. An aged matron, the widow of a revolutionary pensioner, on her last birth-day called her children and grand-children together, and after their festive greetings were over, and the day drew towards a close, she led her eleven children into a parlor chamber, in the centre of which stood a table, bearing a new silver cup, surmounted by a circle of eleven silver cups of like fashion. The venerable mother then stepped forward and took one cup from the eleven, and presented it to her eldest daughter, —a woman of sixty-three years of age. It bore the inscription—"Presented to —— by her mother, as a part of *pension* received for services rendered in the United States army by her father, in 1776." The daughter received the cup with her mother's blessing, and retired to her place. Then the

read the Sermon with attention and candor. To the doctrine of the Sermon, that "we ought to obey God rather than men," when the authority of the one clearly conflicts with that of the other, I have no objection; it is a Scriptural doctrine, which I have ever preached. But I respectfully submit to a discerning public, and to the author himself, whether it is not a fundamental objection to this "*Sermon for the Times*," that it does not recognize civil government as an institution of God, which He commands men to obey; that it practically allows every man to be his own judge as to what does and what does not accord with conscience; and thus encourages insubordination to civil laws; and, above all, that a necessary inference from the Sermon is, that the whole American people are in danger of rushing into open Atheism, through an adherence to the Constitution and Laws of their country!

* Mrs. Phebe Wood, of Woodville, Hopkinton, Ms. See Puritan Recorder, Nov. 21, 1850.

next born came up and received his cup and mother's blessing ; and so all, in the order of their age, until the youngest was blessed, and held in his hand the cup bearing *his own* name, and that of *father* and *mother* surmounting the EAGLE of his country. Then together, each holding in hand the cup of blessing, they sung—

“Blest be the tie that binds.”

Then they read the word of God, bowed in prayer and thanksgiving to the God of all their mercies, and their father's God, and parted after singing the Christian Doxology.

This is true *patriotism* and *religion*. Let them ever be united in our hearts. Let us now and ever bless the Lord our God for the good land which he hath given us. Let us pray for her peace, prosperity and perpetuity. In every hour of trial and danger to our Union, let us adopt the sentiment of the faithful and trustful in Israel, and say of our country, as they of theirs—

“*If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning ; if I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth ; if I prefer not—my country—above my chief [earthly] joy.*”

This discourse is very erroneous

FUGITIVE ^{my}SLAVE LAW.

THE

Religious Duty

OF

OBEDIENCE TO LAW:

SERMON,

Preached in the Second Presbyterian Church

IN BROOKLYN, NOV. 24, 1850.

BY ^{my}ICHABOD S. SPENCER, D D. 1798-1854

* *The glory is departed.*

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY M. W. DODD,

BRICK CHURCH CHAPEL, CITY HALL SQUARE,

OPPOSITE THE CITY HALL.

1850.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1850, by
ICHABOD S. SPENCER,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the
Southern District of New York.

TO THE REV. DR. SPENCER :

The undersigned having listened, with much pleasure and as we hope profit, to the Sermon which you delivered yesterday morning, most respectfully request a copy of the same for publication, believing that much good may be done to the cause of Religion and Law, by the dissemination of the truths expressed therein.

Brooklyn, Monday, Nov. 25, 1850.

JASPER CORNING,
FRANCIS H. ABBOTT,
LEBBEUS CHAPMAN,
F. DEMING,
GEORGE A. TALBOT,
A. M. FENBY,
THOMAS COCHRAN,
WM. BARBOUR,
J. B. WICKHAM,
SAMUEL HUTCHINSON,
WM. H. AMES,
L. HOPKINS,
JARVIS BRUSH,
S. N. BROWN,
GEORGE P. LORD,
H. K. CORNING,
THOS. BAYLIS,
W. K. BROWN,
M. S. GOODMAN,
JAS. WILDE, JR.,
GEO. A. TOWNSEND,
DAVID B. BAYLIS,
HENRY W. BARNES,
ELI MERRILL,
W. M. SANDS,

ISAAC OTIS,
ALANSON TRASK,
CHARLES CLARK,
JOHN T. LAWRENCE,
A. S. MARVIN,
WM. M. HARRIS,
R. R. FIELD,
SAMUEL T. HUBBARD,
RICHARD W. HUBBARD,
A. G. TRASK,
JOHN H. PRENTICE,
WALDO HUTCHINS,
E. L. BUSHNELL,
SUMNER STONE,
JOSEPH STEELE,
JAS. McLEAN,
J. C. MEEKER,
J. S. PIERSON,
A. G. JENNINGS, JR.,
B. W. DeLAMATER,
W. SPENCER,
J. C. DURYEA,
A. CRITTENDEN,
HENRY ROWLAND,
WM. BULLARD,

JN. BULLARD, JR.

TO JASPER CORNING, Esq., AND OTHERS :

GENTLEMEN—The sermon which you have requested, prepared without a single thought of its publication, and amid a pressure of other duties, I submit to your disposal;—governed more by your judgment than my own, in reference to its fitness for the press.

Yours, very truly,

I. S. SPENCER.

Brooklyn, Nov. 26, 1850.

SERMON.

TITUS, III. 1. Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready for every good work.

Ro. xiii. 1-7. Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God, the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation: (harm, loss, or ruin). For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also, for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.

There are two great classes of human duty. One of them embraces duties which we owe to God, the other embraces duties which we owe to men.

This classification of duties received the sanction of Jesus Christ, when he spake of *loving the Lord our God with all our heart*, as the spirit and sum of the one class of duties, and of *loving our neighbor as ourselves*, as the spirit and sum of the other class of duties. It had also been previously taught at Mount Sinai, when God gave to Moses the two tables of the law—the one enjoining our duty to God, the other enjoining our duty to man.

This classification of duties is not arbitrary. It is founded on truth and nature. Men have relations to God, as their Creator, Upholder, Governor, Redeemer, and rightful Judge; and they are bound to recognize these relations, and feel and act accordingly. Men hold relations to one another, as parents, children, citizens, rulers, and subjects; and they are bound to recognize these relations, and feel and act accordingly. Such is the will of God. Such is the law of God. There can be no holiness in man aside from conformity to the will of God in this thing.

This principle is carried out in all the teachings of the New Testament, with an emphasis and a plainness which no candid and unprejudiced mind can fail to understand. Jesus Christ has incorporated it into his sermon on the mount in many particulars, wherein he insists upon our social duties, while he teaches religion. He preached this principle when he said, "render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." He practised on this principle when he made the fish bring in his mouth the tribute-money which, as a citizen, he owed to the government of the country,—a government a thousand-fold more oppressive than ours.

It would be a fundamental error, if we were to maintain, that *religion* has nothing to do with the regulation of our conduct towards one another,—as parents, as children, as magistrates, subjects and citizens; but that it has left all that field of duty to be regulated by the individual preferences of men. It has not done so. Social duties come as really within the field of *religious* obligation, as any other

duties. "The fifth commandment requireth the preserving the honor and performing the duties belonging to every one in their several places and relations, as superiors, inferiors, and equals." As men, in any relationship we hold, neighbors, citizens of the state, children, parents, or any other earthly connection, religion extends its authority over us; and our conduct in each one of these relationships constitutes a part of our holiness or our sin.

God has not seen fit to enact special or particular laws for us, to regulate our conduct in all respects, as here associated with one another, and owing duties to one another, as neighbors, citizens of the commonwealth, husbands, wives, and children. He has himself enacted only *general* laws for us,—laid down great general principles, under the authority and light of which, he has left men to regulate the particulars as they please, by the governments which they establish,—only not contravening his great general principles and laws.

He has himself made *all* the laws which are needful, and all which can be justly obligatory upon us in respect to *divine worship*,—such duties as praise, prayer, preaching the gospel, and observing the sacramental ordinances;—and no human authority may either repeal these laws or add to them. But in respect to the duties which we owe to our neighbor, that is, to our fellow-man, in any relation he holds to us or can ever hold; God has left the most of these duties to the authoritative decision of human governments. He has thus made a difference betwixt these two classes of duties. The reason for this difference seems to be this;

namely, man's wisdom can reach farther in ascertaining what is fit or right betwixt him and his fellow-man, than in ascertaining what is fit or right betwixt him and his God: and consequently, man can legislate in respect to property, and other matters of human right, but not in respect to prayer, and other matters of the first class of duties. Moreover, in respect to worship, God is himself one of the parties. The parties are not man and man, as they are in all social duties; but they are man and God:—and therefore, it would seem but fit and natural, that God should legislate *exclusively* in respect to the duties which we owe to *Him*, and more specifically, than in respect to the duties which we owe to one another. Hence, we find it so. { Explicit divine law regulates all the *particulars* of the one class of duties; the *particulars* of the other class of duties are left to human law, or the regulations of human society.

But this latter class of duties, that is, our social duties, are *not left* to the *individual* judgment or independent choice of men, in such a sense, that they may obey or disobey human government just as they please. Not in the least. Human government is by the divine will. Obedience to it is obligatory upon men, by the will and law of God. St. Paul directing Titus how to preach, (and therefore directing all ministers of the gospel who come after him,) says to him, "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates:" and I am doing it in this sermon. Human government is of divine authority, not the *kind*, but the fact. And consequently, our action about human government, our obedience to it, and our dis-

obedience, are as much matters of religion, and coming under its authority and obligation, as are any other matters. If religion had nothing to do with them, I would have nothing to do with them here. But it *has* something to do with them. Human government is a divine ordinance. It is of divine authority. It is *not* a thing of mere human authority. Our *religion*, therefore, our holiness and final salvation are concerned in our sentiments, principles, and conduct in reference to human government. If God *has* left to men the choice of the *kind* of government they will have, he has *not* left it to their choice whether they will *obey* human government or not. He has commanded that obedience. Human government and law are by the will of God. This is a religious principle. And almost the entire sum of our second class of duties, by the will of God, lies under the regulation of human government. God has himself legislated in respect to the other class of duties. Human government is founded on the revealed will of God.

The different expressions contained in the texts which we have just read in your hearing, place this principle beyond all controversy. Glance at them again. "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates." (I am doing so—I am preaching gospel this morning.) "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but *of God*. The powers that be, are ordained *of God*. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance *of God*. Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same, for he is a

they are good

at the same time

117

minister of *God* to thee for good." We are commanded to be "subject for conscience' sake." Magistrates "are God's ministers."—What could be plainer?—This is *religion*: not politics, but religion. Human government is "ordained of God." Magistrates are "ministers of God," to whom men are commanded to be "subject for conscience' sake."

This, therefore, settles the principle, on which obedience to human government is the religious duty of men. There may be a point where that obedience may justly stop, (a matter which we shall consider soon;) but the great principle before us now is an important one, namely, that human government and Law are things which exist by the will of God, and men are bound to submit to them on that high ground. This is the general rule. This is a *religious* duty; whatever exceptions we may be able to find sometimes, among the diversities of human Law and human condition under it,—or when human Law would interfere with the first class of our duties, which God does not allow it to do. "The powers that be, are ordained of God."

Let it, therefore, be carefully noticed, that no man or body of men has any right to say, that they will be without government, without Law, or that religion has nothing to do with the question of their civil obedience to Law. Such obedience must *be a part* of their religion, or they cannot be Christians. It is a part of the *will and ordinance* of God.

Among politicians and statesmen, the idea of what they call "the social compact" is a very familiar idea, and sometimes figures largely. They mean by this, that there exists

+ And some of them the *ministers*

between the different members of every civilized and orderly community, a tacit "compact" or agreement, by which each individual tacitly or impliedly consents to surrender some of his natural rights into the hands of the community in general, or the hands of its government, in order to have the power of the community in general, or power of its government protect him in the enjoyment of others of his rights. Thus, they tell us, that each man receives a benefit from the power of society or government, which he could not secure by his individual power, and receives it in return for the individual natural rights, which he surrenders to the general society or government: so that, on the whole, this "compact" between him and the body politic is beneficial to him. For example, he might not be able to defend his farm from the violence of unjust men, who might deprive him of it; and so he procures the aid of civil government to defend it for him, and in return for this benefit he consents that his farm shall be taxed, and consents also to forego his personal right to defend it himself in any manner he could, and let the government defend it for him in their own way. So of all other civil provisions, rights and duties under the civil government. Politicians are accustomed to refer them all to "the social compact."

I do not complain of this idea of a "social compact," when the idea is presented merely as a justification of government, or as an *explanation* of the propriety, necessity and equity of Law. But when it is presented as *the foundation* on which civil government reposes, though it may satisfy a citizen, it ought not at all to satisfy a Christian.

x The truth is, there is no such "social compact." The idea is only a fancy. Human government is not founded on any such "social compact" at all. It either exists by force, or it is founded on the will of God, in every case. Its *just* foundation is the will of God. And when men are submitting to human government, they are not to consider themselves as merely carrying out the implied conditions of a "social compact;" but their duty is, to consider themselves as submitting to an *ordinance* of their God and Maker. Human government is of a more high and sacred and solemn character, than the mere idea of a "social compact" would make it. God has something to do with it—much to do with it. His will is the solid foundation on which it rests, (even though at first it may have been established by force,) and every man is religiously bound to regulate his obedience or disobedience to human government on this divinely revealed principle. "The social compact" may be a very good idea to employ for convincing an infidel in respect to the right of Law; but it is too low and loose an idea for a Christian; it falls far below the truth, and below the just solemnity of obligation.

11 The *necessity* of human Law results very much, if not entirely, from the injustice of mankind. In no age since the fall of Adam, has any considerable body of men been found so just and upright, that civil Law could be dispensed with. The bad would do injustice to the good, if it were not for Law, and those magistrates appointed by Law, who are "a terror to evil doers." Conscience is not effective in the breast of every sinner, and therefore Law must

Most men are not
force

& are not laws often unjust

come in, to hinder that injustice, which, without it, would not be hindered by individual conscience, and to compel that righteousness which, without it, individual conscience would fail to enforce. As individual conscience becomes more stringent, civil Law may become more lax. If men would be just towards one another of themselves, there would be no necessity of human Law, to compel them to abstain from injury and to perform their duties to one another.

Consequently, Law is a friend to the human race. It is the protector of the good man; and it punishes the bad man, only for the purpose of securing rights,—property, liberty) and life. And even the bad would be worse off a thousand fold than they are, if there were no efficient Law to restrain them by its authority and sanctions.

The *importance* of civil Law is vastly great. Its importance can scarcely be exaggerated by any representation. The most of our earthly happiness lies under the protection of human Law, and lies there by the will of God. We have not an item of property, in land, or houses, or goods, or chattels, or money, which the Law does not guard for us; and we have very little indeed, which we could effectually guard for ourselves. If this protecting, guarding Law is not enforced,—if the Law is obstructed, or crippled, or baffled, or violently set at naught; then, the security of civilized society is gone, and our property, our liberty, our rights, privileges and life, just lie at the mercy of every unjust man, and any violent and excited band of the wick-

if law strong then injustice
 is not null and of no effect

ed!—So important to us is the potential dominion and regular administration of Law.

Moreover our very rights in religion, our privilege to have the word of God and read it, to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, to preach the gospel and hear it, are rights and privileges, which, in this unjust world, we could not enjoy for a single year, aside from the protection and potential administration of human government.

If this human government, the government of Law, cannot be maintained, therefore, there is nothing on earth valuable to us, which is secure for a single hour! If the Law cannot be enforced, then government is at an end and anarchy reigns, and all is confusion, uncertainty, and violence! Order, civilization, Christianity is not safe!

There is indeed a *limit* to the obedience due to human government. Such government may become, and sometimes does become, so unjust, oppressive, tyrannical, and cruel, as not to answer the designed, and righteous, and beneficial purposes of government for a whole people; and in such a case, it deserves no respect as an ordinance of God, for it is then acting contrary to the will of God and the necessity of society; and the injured and oppressed people may justly rise in rebellion against such a government, and overthrow it, if they can. But, let it be carefully remembered, that any violent resistance is positive rebellion against the government; and either that resistance must be crushed, or the government must be overturned. There is no middle way—there can be none. In such a case the

Yes there is. Governments may
 modify or repeal unjust laws and
 thus satisfy those who are reasonably

whole authority and power of the government come into direct hostility and conflict with the violence which resists the execution of Law ; and government must crush that violence, or that violence must crush the government. A government is at an end, a nullity, when it cannot execute its laws. Let it be carefully remembered also, that violent resistance to Law cannot be justified, when there is no righteous design to overthrow the government itself ; for no man owes a *half*-allegiance to government, or can commit a *half*-high-treason ; and besides, Law is too important and delicate a thing to have its majesty trifled with, by the wicked nonsense of a *half*-obedience. Let it be carefully remembered also, that violent resistance to Law cannot be justified, when there is no fair prospect of overthrowing the government, and being able to establish a better one. To justify violent resistance to the laws, it is not enough that the government is unjust and its laws unrighteous ; it is necessary also, that there should be no good ground to hope for a cessation of that unrighteousness in some peaceful way, and that there should be a prospect of some good to be gained by the resistance, which good shall be worth more than all the labor, and treasure, and strife, and blood, which the revolution shall cost. Let it be carefully remembered, too, that violent resistance on any one point is rebellion on every point, for " he that offendeth in one point is guilty of all : " such resistance is opposition by force to one entire government—is just a conflict with the powers that be ; so that any resisting individual or number of individuals who commence a violent resistance on any one point, have cast

of course must never report
 the same kind of conflict
 without having shown
 discrimination between
 the good and the bad

Discrimination between
 the good and the bad

off their allegiance to the entire government, and stand in the attitude of open and hostile rebellion.

It may not be an easy thing to settle the right of rebellion—to determine the question, when a people have a right forcibly to resist the execution of regularly enacted Law. But we *can* tell *something* about it. There are some things perfectly clear on this point.

1. To justify rebellion, (or what is the same thing, forcible resistance of the laws,) a government must be so bad, as to fail manifestly of its just end, that is, to promote the happiness of the people. If it does promote that general happiness, it answers the just end of government—it is a good government, and ought not to be overthrown.

2. To justify rebellion, the injustice or failure of a government must be so great, that it cannot be endured,—so great, that it will manifestly be better on the whole, to run all the risks of a bloody conflict, of civil war, than to endure the execution of the governmental laws.

3. To justify rebellion, there must be little or no prospect that the government can be peaceably altered, as ours may be, or that the injustice or oppression of the government can be made to cease by any peaceable means. Violence against government, rebellion, civil war, are no small matters. They bring horrid evils along with them. The injury of government must be very great to justify the introduction of such evils; and if the injury can be made to cease by any peaceable means and within any reasonable time, it would be better to bear the injury for a while, than to involve the nation in confusion and blood, with uncertainty as

to the result.—The last four years' experience of nations in Europe may read us a lesson.

X A republic is different from a despotism. A nation where a Constitution forming the foundation of Law, limiting its enactments and establishing courts, is plainly written out in language that everybody can understand,—where Constitution and Law provide for their own amendment at the will of the sovereign people expressed in a regular and solemn manner,—where the will of the people thus governs, and (for example,) there is no "taxation without representation,"—where the elective franchise is free, and every man capable of intelligently exercising the right may give his voice for altering the Constitution or Law,—and where, therefore, there can be no necessity of violently opposing the laws, and no excuse for meanly evading them;—*such* a nation is very differently conditioned from what it would be, if the will of one man or of a few governed. In such a nation, rebellion, or any evasion of Law, becomes a more serious moral evil. Rebellion *there* can scarcely be called for; and it were difficult to gauge the dimensions of its unrighteousness!

4. To justify rebellion, it is necessary that there should be a fair prospect of successful resistance—of an overthrow of the government. If the resistance is not likely to be successful for good, but is only likely to cost the lives of the resisting individuals and others; then, such individuals are sacrificing themselves and others for no good purpose,—which is a thing that cannot be justified to reason or religion.

(A man has no right to fling away his life for a mere sentiment, and leave his wife a widow, or his gray-haired parents

3

the they both who the wife
and of God

without a son to solace them. There must be some fair prospect of great good to come from it, before one can justly fling his life into the scale, in a violent contest with the government. *What of Samuel?*

5. To justify rebellion, there must be a fair prospect of the firm *establishment of a better government*, and the enactment of more just laws, after the present government is overturned. Nothing can justify a revolution, a conflict, a waste of treasure and blood, which are not going to *gain anything* in the end.—Again, the last four years' experience of European nations may read us a lesson.

6. To justify rebellion, or what is the same thing, violent resistance to the execution of the laws, it is necessary that something more than a *small fraction* of the people should rise in such a resistance. If the people in general are ready for it, and are willing to run all the hazards of a rebellious conflict with the government, conscious that they have righteousness and the God of righteousness on their side; this is a very different affair from what it would be, if only a minority of the people were ready for rebellion. Such a minority have no right, on account of their deemed injuries, to plunge the nation into a civil war, for the purpose of overturning a government which suits the great mass of the people;—a civil war, in which there is every prospect, that the government and the majority who aim to support it will prevail; and prevailing, must crush their hostile opponents, this hasty and reckless minority.

These are some of the things which appear necessary, in order to justify violent resistance of Law. They must *all*

exist, or such resistance would be criminal,—contrary to reason, to benevolence, and to Christ.

It is not a thing to be expected at all among mankind, that all laws should be right, or "just and equal." Human legislation must be expected to bear the marks of an imperfection, which attaches itself to everything human. If obedience to government were obligatory, only on the condition that all the laws of that government are just; then, such obedience would mean nothing at all, and every man would be absolved from all allegiance to the government, and from all obligations to obey. Such is man, so limited his wisdom and so imperfect his holiness, that human laws must necessarily be imperfect, and must, therefore, necessarily operate hardly in some instances, upon more or less of the people. It is impossible, that the thing should be otherwise—in the very nature of the case, it is impossible. And if every individual were allowed to be the judge in his own case, whether or not the law operated so hardly upon him that he might disobey; *then* his *obligation* to obedience would mean just nothing at all, and Law would be nothing more to him than mere advice. It might be very good advice, but he might spurn it, if he chose. *I* may think it hard and unjust upon myself, that, in the great "Empire State," by a sort of "bill of attainder," (I know not what else to call it,—I suppose I must not call it a *slave law*,) I am prohibited from holding any "office of profit or trust," because *I will preach* the gospel, and people will hear me;—but notwithstanding this law, (which you will not allow me to call by any hard name,) you think me under obligation

x Yes it would be *incumbent* on
 would be *incumbent* on *me*

to obey the government,—and I think so too. I shall not rebel.

The *execution* of the Law also, must necessarily be imperfect, for the same great reason—human imperfection: judges and jurors are not infallible. But, what then? *God knew all this* when he ordained human government, and commanded us to be subject to it. Such government, with all its unavoidable imperfection and errors, on the whole is beneficial—indispensable—we could not do without it.—And rarely, very rarely indeed, is there a single instance of an individual man, here or beyond the Potomac, whom Law has injured *more* than it has benefited. Even if that Law unjustly takes away his liberty or his life, it may have done him more good than injury; his liberty or his life might have been sooner and more cruelly destroyed without it. It would be hard to prove the contrary, in any one case that ever existed or ever will, here or elsewhere.

The best and wisest Laws ever enacted by man, or that ever will be enacted by man, may sometimes operate hardly, even destructively, upon some particular persons. An innocent man may be accused of murder, tried, convicted, and sentenced to ignominious execution. But, *what then?* May this man, who *knows* his innocence, justly arm himself with deadly weapons, and kill the officer who would execute the sentence of the Law upon him,—and thus get out of his hands? May this innocent man's neighbors, who know his innocence as well as he, "*lawfully interpose their own persons*" betwixt him and the officer of Law, and thus rescue him?—and may they do this, because they have

*An officer ought not to execute
death on a condemned man who
knows or believes to be innocent but*

decided for themselves, that this is not a case "*where the administration of justice is concerned*"? If so, then all Law and Government must soon come to an end, and anarchy, mobs and confusion reign! If so, then each man becomes really his own Lawmaker, and when *he thinks* the Law unjust towards him, may resist it unto blood! If one man is at liberty to "*be fully prepared for his own defense*," and calling the legal officer an "assailant," or an "assassin," may resist the execution of one law which he deems hard upon him, then another man may do the same thing in reference to another law; and the consequence inevitably must be, that all Government, Law and security are at end! If my neighbor may arm *himself*, and kill a legal officer who attempts the discharge of his sworn duty; then I may arm *myself* also, when I deem the Law unjust to me, and kill another legal officer, who attempts to execute the Law! And if all this may be, LAW is nothing but a bugbear or a bubble—is a dead letter—and the texts of God's word which we have just read to you may be disobeyed, and ought to be blotted from the Bible!

My brethren, this is a very solemn subject! No theme of earth could be more so. All our earthly benefits, and no small part of our spiritual privileges and hopes are wrapped up in it. Religion *cannot* prosper, if Law is not potential—if the minds of the people are to be perpetually agitated, distracted and tormented, by confusion, fear and uncertainty!

I have stated these great principles, and made these gen-

eral remarks upon the subject presented in our texts, on account of some recent teachings which have been put forth as *religious*—put forth in *religious* publications, by *ministers* of the gospel. I have no reference to mere politics—to political papers or political parties, whig or democrat. I have never entered into such matters : other things occupy me. I have never given but one vote in any legal election, during the eighteen years I have resided in the State since I returned to it ; and I never expect to give another. And if principles opposite to those I have laid down in this sermon were promulgated among us, only by politicians and political parties and papers, I should not advert to them here. I have always supposed, that some extravagant and evil principles would be occasionally promulgated for party purposes and political effect, and that the people very well understand this, and therefore will not be led very far astray by them. And whenever such evil principles have been put forth in the name of religion, by men whose fanatical phrensy contemned the Sabbath and other institutions of God, (like some of our Northern fanatics, “men of one idea” and not capable of two,) I have very seldom adverted to them at all, but have supposed it best to leave them to be counteracted by their own extravagance and by the character of their advocates, and let them die by their own contemptibility. But now, principles, contrary to the plain meaning of the texts before us, come to our éars from some more respectable quarters, and in the name of religion. I should be a traitor to the high trust of this pulpit, if I did not caution you against them. Forbearance and delicacy

must sometimes have limits. We owe duties to truth and Christianity, which tenderness must not make us violate.

The "New York Evangelical Congregational Association" recently passed the following Resolution in respect to the "Fugitive-Slave Law,"—a Law regularly enacted by the Congress of the United States :—

"Resolved, That we cannot recognize this Law, as of any binding force upon the citizens of our country."—(I am thankful that these modest men did not go on, like him of the triple crown, to absolve "the citizens of our country" from all allegiance to the government, and give our rulers over into the hands of a majesty fit to take care of them.)

A *religious* paper, edited by Congregational clergymen, holding respectable stations, Pastors of churches,—a paper professedly devoted to the cause of Christ,—holds the following language in an *Editorial* article, under the caption, "How to oppose the Fugitive-Slave Law":—

This *religious* paper says,—“To the fugitives themselves . . . this Law is no Law . . . and to resist it even unto death, is their right, and it may be their duty To each *individual* fugitive, to every man or woman, who having escaped from bondage and tasted liberty, is in hourly peril of being seized and dragged back to slavery, we say,—Be fully prepared for your own defense. If to you death seems better than slavery, then refuse not to die—whether on the way-side, at your own threshold, or even as a felon upon the gallows. Defend your liberty and the liberty of your wife and children, as you would defend your life and theirs against the assassin. If you die thus, you

die nobly, and your blood shall be the redemption of your race. Should you destroy the life of your assailant, you will pass into the custody of the criminal Law under an indictment for murder; but the verdict of the community, and the verdict of almost any jury will be, justifiable homicide in self-defense Or should a different verdict be found, and you be condemned to die as a murderer, your ignominious death shall be luminous with the halo of a martyr, and your sacrifice shall be for the deliverance of your people."

Such are the *religious* principles, and such is the *religious* advice of these *religious* ministers!

Oh I am sorry to see this. *I never read more wicked and abominable principles!* They deserve not only the reprehension of every christian, but the entire indignation of *all civilized mankind!* They advise private arming with bloody weapons—they advise violent resistance and murder—the murder of officers of civil Law engaged in the discharge of the duty which they have sworn to perform! I have no words to express my abhorrence of these wicked and outrageous sentiments, so directly contrary to the whole nature of all civilized society, to the precepts of the Bible, and the whole spirit of Christianity! I speak not of the *men*. Good men may err. But these principles, which these ministers have published as religious ones, are horribly and outrageously wicked!

There are other things in this religious paper, which we think are calculated to do immense mischief. This editorial article "would utter its remonstrance against all violent re-

Words to the effect that finding

sistance to the execution of the Law." Indeed! Very quiet and peaceful, after having talked about being "fully prepared for defense"—about death "on the wayside, at the threshold and on the gallows"—about "murder," and about "martyrdom." Away with such morality! aiming at one thing and professing another!—"If one sees a fellow man struggling with his captors, he may lawfully interpose his own person between the parties and separate them." Away with such morality! encouraging people to "act a lie," by opposing Law while professing to obey it! And this species of morality is virtually commended to the jury-box; and its inmates are furnished in advance with a verdict here prepared for their use—"justifiable homicide in self-defense"! Away with such morality! encouraging a juror to violate his oath, by disregarding the Law, which he has just sworn to his country and to his God, shall govern his verdict! and encouraging a fugitive to expect him to do so!—We may yet see whether the jurymen of our country will regard their oath, or will follow the religious counsel of this religious paper.

I am not justifying slavery. I am pleading obedience to the texts before me. Slavery may be wrong. Be it so; there is still a *righteous* method to get rid of it. But if slavery *is* wrong, that does not make violence and murder *right*.

I am not justifying the fugitive-slave Law. (It may be wrong: it may be unwise and unconstitutional.) I think that any wise and modest man would hesitate much to pro-

nounce it unconstitutional, after its enactment by a body of men who *aimed* to abide by the constitution, and who studied the matter most intensely, with every opportunity for information and with minds trained for years in the depths of legal science. But, be it wrong—be it unwise and unconstitutional; there are civil courts to decide upon its constitutionality, and no man has *any right* to decide for *himself* that it is unconstitutional, and act upon that decision: if he had such a right, then every man would be his own Lawmaker, and public Constitution and Law would be nothing but a bugbear or a bubble! Be it wrong; there is a peaceful, prescribed way of amending both Law and Constitution,—and a wrong in the Law does not make false-swearing by the juryman and murder by the fugitive right! *Is self defence ever right?*

It is a most marvellous thing, what a number of clergymen north of Mason and Dixon's line, have, all of a sudden, become such great *Constitutional lawyers*! Never before was anything like it! It is a modern miracle! A decision upon a great constitutional question is nothing to them! How amazingly these profound legalists, these clergyman jurists, would adorn the high courts of the country, if they would only consent to take their seat upon the bench! The Judges of the United States Supreme Court ought to be thankful, that these clergymen Judges have done their duty for them in advance, deciding the law to be unconstitutional, and no more is to be done! Benevolent men, these clergymen! Some have done the duty of the jurors for them, and others the duty of the judges—the verdict and the decision

Richardson

are both recorded! yea indeed, in advance, and without pay!

But seriously, it were far better, that these clergymen should attend to their own appropriate duties to which their Master has bidden them, than to be engaged in fostering excitements among their people, which *never can* result in any good, civil or religious. If we shall have the rebellion, disunion, and civil war, to which these evil principles and these excitements tend, the guilt of such clergymen will not be small! I would not have their accountability for all the gold of Ophir!

But it is not all the clergymen of this part of the country, nor the most of them, nor the half of them, who have turned Constitutional lawyers, or turned law opposers. I hesitate not to say, it is only a small minority, and those in general who are not entitled to the most respect for erudition, sense, or excellence of character. The (New School) Synod of New York and New Jersey, as respectable a body of ministers and elders as is to be found in the Presbyterian Church, at their late meeting in this city, had good sense enough, and good religion enough, to "leave the constitutionality of the recent enactment" (the Fugitive Slave Law) "to be adjudicated by the civil tribunals of the country." They deserve the thanks of the country and of all mankind. The solid sense and real religion of the land will respect their decision.

I have nothing to do with politics or party. I am only insisting upon religious obedience to Law. I am preaching the texts before me. Such obedience is a religious duty.

X Is it not our duty to present to these people this duty in the various situations of life?

It is the will of God. I appeal to the texts. They proclaim the Law of God. Peaceful subjection to government *is* his law; and men are guilty of sophistry and falsehood, when, to excuse wicked evasion of Law or violent resistance, they pretend to appeal to what they call "the higher laws of God." *There are no such higher laws.* The texts before me are his law. If one man has a moral right, either cunningly to evade or openly to violate Law, under such pleading, then another man has the same right to violate *another* Law; and thus any villainy on earth may be perpetrated under the sacred names of "conscience," and "the higher laws of God!" Nothing is *safe* in the hands of men of such principles. These principles undermine the foundations of *all society among men!* As I told you last Wednesday evening in my lecture, the question before the country is *not*, (as the deceivers pretend,) whether God's laws are not higher than man's, or whether God's laws are to be obeyed. Nobody disputes either of these things. Nobody ever did. But the question is, whether it is the will of God that men should submit to the laws of the land, or aim to paralyze law, cheat it, cripple it, resist it, and thus overthrow the government of the country—a government at this moment more beneficial than any other that ever existed.

Nor is it true, that the fugitive slave is made an "outlaw," and on *that* ground justifiable for bloody and murderous resistance of Law. He is under the protection of Law; and if any man injures him or kills him, the Law will avenge him, just as soon as it would you or me. He is *not* made an outlaw: common sense knows better.

x Abominable rant with
discriminating in the least between
good & bad. P. the very worst

Nothing ever will be done to right
oppression and cruelty.

The matter before us is a very serious matter. The wicked principles of which I have spoken, disguise it as you will, tend directly to anarchy, confusion, and civil war! The question *is not*, whether slavery is right, or the Fugitive Slave Law right. It draws deeper. The question is, shall Law be put in force, and the government of the country stand; or shall Law be resisted, and the government of the country disobeyed, and the nation plunged into all the horrors of civil war? If Law cannot be executed, it is time to write the epitaph of your country!

Suffer me to utter a few words of earnest counsel to you, my beloved people.

1. Beware of the influence of *mere feeling* on this serious subject. Your feelings may be with the slave,—so are mine, so are those of most of the Southern people. We all want men to be free; and *no more* do we want it now, than did the inhabitants of this country before we were born: the extravagant fanaticism and noisy zeal of the Northern abolitionists have not increased the sentiment of the country in favour of freedom a single item. But what can we *do*? This is a very grave and difficult subject. One thing is certain,—the perpetual abuse of our Southern brethren, violence, disunion, and bloody murder will do us no good,—whether we are bondmen or freemen. And when we think on this subject, let us aim to be cool, unimpassioned, deliberate, and give reason and religion their just influence over us.

2. Beware of prejudice. Do not make up your mind hastily, and under the impulses of mere feeling, without

any just and extensive information. Study the matter calmly, extensively, and on all sides and aspects of it.

3. Study it *religiously*. Keep it, in your mind, aloof from all the excitements and influences of party and party spirit. Let me say to you, my beloved people, study it on your knees, in earnest prayer to God. Learn your duty from God's word, praying in the Holy Ghost.

4. Aim to cultivate the entire spirit of your Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Feel as he felt. Act as he acted. Pray as he prayed. Seek the *salvation* of sinners, as he sought it,—evidently putting more value upon *that* for every dying son of Adam, than upon all things earthly. Oh remember, you *will be the best citizens, just when you are the best Christians*;—and I do believe in my heart, you will do most earthly good to your fellow-men, just when you do them most spiritual good,—leading them, by example, by precept, and prayer, to “seek *first* the kingdom of God.”

5. Be obedient to the laws of your land. Do not resist these *ordinances of God*. Stand by the Constitution of your country. If that die, *the most* of your happiness and your hopes die with it!—yea, it would be a calamity to the civilized world! Christianity herself would be hindered a whole century in her march! Respect your rulers. Frown indignantly upon the low and vile abuse now heaped so liberally upon the great men of your country. Be peaceful citizens. Be a *law-abiding people*, with all your sentiments opposed to violence, bloodshed, and confusion; and aim to allay all the excited and angry feelings that may come up around you.

Then Schabod's excited feelings must be allayed!

Now you must take
him, and submit directly
against the author

ought on ways

Finally; have your hope and your trust in God. Men women, and children, I beseech every one of you to beware of the spirit of worldliness, and the excitements of worldly subjects and interests; and let not such interests and subjects prevent your conversion to Christ, your holiness and eternal salvation. Pray for yourselves, your children, your rulers; and let your prayerful and humble trust in God hold you safe, amid all the agitations of a world that you must soon leave for another. God grant it to you, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

"THE HIGHER LAW,"

IN ITS APPLICATION TO

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE BILL.

A SERMON

ON THE

DUTIES MEN OWE TO GOD

AND TO GOVERNMENTS.

DELIVERED AT THE CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
BUFFALO, ON THANKSGIVING-DAY.

BY

JOHN C. LORD, D. D., 1851

(*Pastor of said Church,*)

AUTHOR OF "LECTURES ON GOVERNMENT AND CIVILIZATION."

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF THE

"UNION SAFETY COMMITTEE."

1851.

JOHN F. TROW, PRINTER,
49, 51, & 53 ANN-STREET, NEW-YORK.

S E R M O N .

Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto Him a penny. And He saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto Him, Cæsar's. Then saith He unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God, the things that are God's.—MATT. xxii. 17-21.

WE are summoned to-day by the proclamation of the Chief Magistrate of this State, to consider and acknowledge the mercies of God during the year that is past. As individuals, for ourselves, and our households, it becomes us to acknowledge our personal deliverances, and the varied proofs of the Divine goodness which we have experienced since we last assembled to render our annual tribute of praise, prayer, and thanksgiving to Him—"who causeth the outgoings of the morning and the evening to rejoice; who giveth the early and the latter rain; who appointeth fruitful seasons and abundant harvests; who openeth his hand and satisfieth the desire of every living thing." As citizens, it concerns us to consider the general prosperity of the State and the Nation, to notice the various tokens of the Divine mercy in regard to the preservation of the free government under which we live, founded by the sacrifices of our pious ancestry, and perpetuated, as we may well believe, for this reason, among others, that their "prayers are yet had in remembrance before God, and their tears preserved in his bottle." As individuals, our presence in this house to-day is a proof of the personal mercies which should lead us to offer the acceptable sacrifice of praise. Some who once sat with us in this sanctuary have gone to the congregation of the dead; deaf to the requiem which the winds of winter are now mournfully murmuring over their graves; insensible to all sounds, until the palsied ear shall hear the "voice of the archangel and the trump of God;" others are upon beds of sickness, pain, and sorrow, and know not whether they shall enter again the house of prayer, to mingle their praises with yours, or pass from the couch of suffering to the life to come, to behold the mysteries of the unseen world, and worship with that august throng, that "innumerable company of angels and spirits of just men made perfect," who fill the arches of Heaven with the voices of praise and thanksgiving, ascribing "blessing and honor and dominion and power to Him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever." Some are full of affliction, oppressed with poverty or overwhelmed with reverses, which prevent them from mingling with us in the worship of the sanctuary on this day of thanksgiving: and alas! that it should be so—there are others who are full of prosperity, "whose eyes stick out with fatness, who are not in trouble as other men," who are so unmindful

of their dependence upon Him in "whom they live and move and have their being," so regardless of all the goodness and mercy of God, that they never darken the doors of the house of prayer, and never unite in the worship and praise of the Father of mercies. But by *our* presence in this place to-day, we are seen to be the witnesses of the Divine goodness, we acknowledge ourselves the recipients of unnumbered favors, we propose to offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and call upon our souls and all within us to magnify the name of our Father, Preserver, Benefactor, and Redeemer.

But not alone for private and personal mercies should we render thanks to-day. As citizens of this State, and of the great Republic of which it is the chief member, we are called to consider the preservation of public tranquillity, the adjustment of sectional difficulties, and the continuance of the bonds of our union, amid excitements which threatened its integrity; amid a storm, the original violence of which is manifest in the clouds which yet obscure our political horizon; in the deep-toned thunders that are yet muttering in the distance. It is not necessary to adopt the opinions of the extreme alarmists in either section of the country, to conclude that great dangers have threatened, if they do not still threaten, the union of these States. It does not require very great discernment to see that the continued agitation of the vexed question of Slavery, producing alienation and distrust between the North and the South, must, in the end, either sever the bonds between the free and the slave States, or render them not worth preserving. A unity maintained by force, if this were possible, would not pay the cost of its keeping. If, in the heat of the existing controversies, these two great sections of the Union come at last to forget their common ancestry, and the mutual perils shared by them in the revolutionary struggle; if South Carolina and Massachusetts, who stood shoulder to shoulder in the doubtful contest for American freedom, come to disregard the voices of their illustrious dead, who lie side by side in every battle-field of the Revolution; if Virginia and New-York refuse, in the heats engendered by this unhappy strife, to listen longer to the voice of Washington, warning them in his farewell address of this very rock of sectional jealousy and alienation; if the words of the Father of his country are no longer regarded with reverence in the ancient commonwealth of his birth, or in the great State whose deliverance from a foreign enemy was the crowning achievement of his military career; and if the compromises upon which the Union was consummated, continue to be denied or disregarded; there is an end of the confederacy. If the stronger should crush the weaker, and hold on to an apparent union with the grasp of military power, it would no longer be a confederacy, but a conquest. When there is no longer mutual respect; no more fraternal forbearance; no more regard for each other's local interests; no more obedience in one section to the laws which protect the guaranteed rights of the other; the basis of union is wanting, and nothing but a military despotism, with a grasp of iron, and a wall of fire, can hold the discordant elements together.

In the discussions which the recent agitations of the country have originated, grave questions have arisen in regard to the obligation of the citizen to obey laws which he may disapprove; appeals have been made to a HIGHER LAW, as a justification, not merely of a neglect to aid in enforcing a particular statute, but of an open and forcible resistance by arms. Those subject to the operations of the recent enactment of Congress in regard to fugitive slaves have been counselled from the pulpit, and by men who profess a higher Christianity than others, to carry deadly weapons and shoot down any who should attempt to execute its provisions. The whole community at the North have been excited by passionate appeals to a violent and revolutionary resistance

to laws, passed by their own representatives to sustain an express provision of the Constitution of the United States, which, if defective in their details, are yet clearly within the delegated powers and jurisdiction of our national Legislature. The acknowledged principle that the law of God is supreme, and when in direct conflict with any mere human enactment renders it nugatory, has been used to justify an abandonment of the compromises of the Constitution; an armed resistance to the civil authorities, and a dissolution of that Union with which are inseparably connected our national peace and prosperity. The consideration of the duties which men owe to God, as subjects of his moral government, and which, as citizens, they owe the commonwealth, is at all times of importance, but now of especial interest in view of the agitations of the day. It is high time to determine whether one of the highest duties enforced by the Gospel, obedience to the law of God as supreme, can be made to justify a violent resistance to the late enactment of Congress; whether our Christianity enjoins the dissolution of our Union; whether the advocates of a higher law stand really upon this lofty vantage ground of conscience, or are scattering "firebrands, arrows, and death," either under a mistaken view of duty, or the impulses of passion and fanaticism, or inflamed by that demagoguism, which, if it cannot rule, would ruin; which, like Milton's fallen angel, would rather "reign in Hell than serve in Heaven."

That this subject is not out of place in the pulpit, is manifest from the fact that it is strictly a question of morals. Our duties to God constitute the subject matter of revealed religion, and their enforcement is the great business of the Gospel minister; our duties to government FLOW OUT OF OUR RELATION TO THE SUPREME GOVERNOR, as well as our relations to each other, and are clearly pointed out and forcibly enjoined in the Gospel. "Put them in mind," says an Apostle, "to be subject to principalities and powers; to obey magistrates; to be ready to every good work:" "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers; the powers that be are ordained of God." In the text, we are informed of an attempt made by the Jewish casuists to ensnare our Lord in his words, by proposing the question whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Cæsar; it being supposed by them, that any reply he could make would lead him into difficulty; for the Jews were perpetually galled by the Roman yoke, and any response favoring their oppressors would have aroused their indignation; while, if the lawfulness of tribute were denied by the reply of our Lord, it would have given his enemies ground to accuse him before the authorities, of sowing sedition. If our Saviour, in response to the question of the lawfulness of tribute, should answer in the affirmative, the Jews would stone him; if in the negative, the Romans would arraign him as a violator of law. He who knows all hearts perceived their wickedness, and said, "Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Show me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he said unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then said he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God, the things that are God's." Well might "they marvel and go their way," baffled by the answer of divine wisdom. Our Lord escaped their malice, by stating the true principle on which the obedience of the citizen is demanded by government, in the legitimate exercise of its powers. The coining of money is an act of sovereignty; the impress of Cæsar upon the penny was proof that the Romans possessed the government of Judea, *de facto*, and were, therefore, to be obeyed as the supreme authority in all civil enactments; while any attempt to interfere with the religious principles or practices of the Jews might be conscientiously resisted.

We take the ground, that the action of civil governments within their

appropriate jurisdiction is final and conclusive upon the citizen ; and that, to plead a higher law to justify disobedience to a human law, the subject matter of which is within the cognizance of the State, is to reject the authority of God himself ; who has committed to governments the power and authority which they exercise in civil affairs. This is expressly declared by the Apostle in the Epistle to the Romans : " Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God ; the powers that be are ordained of God ; whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. For he (that is, the civil magistrate) beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake ; render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor."

The language here cannot be misunderstood. Obedience to governments, in the exercise of their legitimate powers, is a religious duty, positively enjoined by God himself. The same authority which commands us to render to God the things which are God's, enjoins us, by the same high sanctions, to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's.

The following general principles may be deduced from the sacred Scriptures, and from the example, as well as the teachings, of our Lord and his Apostles.

First.—Government is a divine constitution, established at the beginning by the Creator, which exists of necessity, and is of perpetual obligation. Men are born under law, both as it respects the Law of God and the enactments of States. By the ordination of the supreme law, they owe allegiance to the country of their birth, and are naturally and unavoidably the subjects of its government ; their consent to this is neither asked or given ; their choice can only respect the mode, never the fact of Government. The mutual compact, of which politicians and lawyers speak, is a mere figment of the imagination, without warrant from the word of God, and contradicted by all the facts in the case. We might as well affirm that men agree to be born, and to be subject to their parents, by a mutual compact, in which the child surrenders certain rights for the sake of parental protection, and the parent covenants to provide and govern on the promise of obedience. The statement in the last case is no more absurd than in the first. In the family is found the rudimental government, and the fifth commandment has always been understood by Christians as ordaining subjection to magistrates as well as parents.

Second.—Governments have jurisdiction over men in all affairs which belong peculiarly to the present life ; in all the temporal relations which bind societies, communities, and families together, in respect to all rights of person, and property, and their enforcement by penalties. General rules are, indeed, laid down in the Scriptures for the regulation of human conduct, but God has ordained the " powers that be" to appoint their own municipal laws, to regulate and enforce existing relations, and to execute judgment upon offenders, under such form of administration as shall be suitable to the circumstances of the people, and chosen by themselves. Governments, as to their mode, do not form but follow the character and moral condition of a people, and are an indication of their real condition, intellectually and morally. The idea that the mere change of the form of a despotic government will necessarily elevate a nation, is a mistaken one. A people must be elevated before they can receive free institutions. The mode of government is the index and not the cause of the condition of the different nations of the earth, which may be demonstrated by the history of empires and states, and by the vain efforts,

recently made in Europe, to adopt our institutions, without the moral training and preparation which can alone make them either possible or valuable. France, to-day, is a despotism under the forms of a free government, and maintains her internal tranquillity by a hundred thousand bayonets.

Third.—In regard to his own worship, and the manner in which we are to approach HIM, the Supreme Governor has given full and minute directions. He has revealed himself, his attributes, and the great principles of his government, which constitute the doctrines of Christianity; and has conferred upon no human authority the right to interfere, by adding to or taking from them. **IN THE THINGS THAT BELONG TO HIMSELF**, God exercises sole and absolute jurisdiction, and has, in regard to them, appointed no inferior or delegated authority.

Fourth.—The decisions of governments upon matters within their jurisdiction, though they may be erroneous, are yet, from the necessity of the case, absolute. Every man has a right to test the constitutionality of any law by an appeal to the judiciary, but he cannot interpose his private judgment as a justification of his resistance to an act of the government. Freedom of opinion by no means involves the right to *refuse obedience to law*; for, if this were so, the power to declare war and make peace; to regulate commerce and levy taxes; in short, to perform the most essential acts of government, would be a mere nullity. No statute could be executed on this principle, which would leave every man to do what seemed right in his own eyes, under the plea of a higher law and a delicate conscience. Even courts of justice, which are the constituted tribunals for ascertaining and determining the validity of all legislative enactments, by bringing them to the test of constitutional law and first principles, as well as for the decision of causes arising under the laws in relation to persons and property, may form an erroneous conclusion; for no mere human wisdom is infallible; yet their final decisions are binding, from the same necessity. The fact that an innocent man may be condemned and suffer the penalty of a law which he has never broken, might as well be urged to impeach the authority of a judicial decision, as that the fallibility which is manifest in hasty and unwise legislation, should be alleged as an excuse for resistance to a particular statute.

The private judgments of individuals, for instance, that all wars are unlawful, even those which are defensive; or that the existence of slavery is, *per se*, sinful, is no just ground of resistance to the government which declares war, or the legislation which recognizes domestic servitude, and regulates it. Both these subjects are properly within the jurisdiction of civil government. The State may engage in an unjust war, but does this discharge the subject from his allegiance? No sane man will affirm it. The government may recognize an oppressive form of domestic servitude, or enact laws in relation to it which are deemed by many oppressive. Is this a just ground of forcible resistance on Christian principles? No intelligent man who regards the authority of the Bible can consistently maintain such a position. Many at the North who assert such opinions have long since rejected the authority of the Word of God, and have in their conventions publicly scoffed at divine as well as human authority.

But the position we have taken, that the decisions of governments are final in cases where they have jurisdiction, even when mistaken or oppressive, is not only sustained by the passages which have been cited from the Scriptures, but also by the example and practice of the primitive Christians. The words of our Saviour in the text, and of the Apostle, in his Epistle to the Romans, while they have a general application to all times and all governments, had a particular reference to the existing authorities of Rome, which

were not only despotic in their general administration but peculiarly oppressive in their treatment of the infant church. The government under which our Saviour and the Apostles lived, and of which they spake, was habitually engaged in aggressive wars, aiming at the conquest of the world. Slavery was universal throughout the Roman Empire, and the laws gave the master the power of life and death over his servant. Did the Saviour and his Apostles, on this account, reject their authority, or incite their disciples to disobedience and resistance? Did they interfere with existing civil institutions, urging the slave to escape from his master, the citizen to rebel against the magistrate? Their conduct was the exact reverse of this; they preached to the master forbearance and kindness—to the servant submission and obedience—to both, the Gospel. Paul sent Onesimus back to his master, on the very principles which he enjoined upon the Romans—subjection to existing civil authority. The inspired teachers of Christianity instructed both masters and slaves in regard to the duties which grow out of the institution of *Slavery*, without either approving or condemning the relation itself. They exhorted Soldiers, on the same principle, to be content with their wages, and to forbear from mutiny and cruelty; without offering any opinion concerning the justice or injustice of the Roman wars. They spake indeed of a promised and predicted day, when wars, tumults and oppressions should cease, when at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and there should be none, any more, to hurt or molest in the Mountain of the Lord. The early Christians were, beyond controversy, obedient to the injunction of the Apostle. They obeyed law even when it was onerous or unjust. They had civil and military appointments under the Roman government in which they refused not to serve; they were obedient to the existing civil powers, in all matters within the jurisdiction of the State; they were no abettors of sedition and strife. Whole legions in the armies that were sent out for conquest by Rome, were composed of Christians, who were, doubtless, drawn in the general conscription for this service, and who felt it to be their duty to “render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s;” however much they might dislike the business of war. Not until Cæsar intermeddled with the things of God; not until, passing the legitimate jurisdiction of civil government, the Roman magistrate commanded them to adore the image of the Emperor, and to offer incense to false gods; did the Christian refuse obedience. But here he was immovable; no flattery could subdue, no terrors appal him. Every engine of torture, which the barbarous ingenuity of Rome could invent, failed of its purpose. They were tortured by fire; they were cast out to wild beasts; they were exposed in the amphitheatre to the gaze of thousands, who mocked their dying agonies. Like the ancient prophets, “they were stoned; they were sawn asunder; they were tempted; they were slain with the sword; they wandered in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth.” It was enough, that the Master had said, “render to God the things which are God’s.” Nor was their resistance that of armed and violent men; they assassinated no officers, and excited no seditions, but, after the example of their Lord, suffered with that passive firmness, which is the highest form of courage. But it may be replied to this, Your argument proves too much. You reaffirm the old doctrine of tyrants, of passive obedience and non-resistance; your position would render all revolutions unlawful; all changes of government impossible. To this it may be said, that it does not belong to the Church in her organized capacity, nor to Christians, considered solely as such, and with reference to their religious duties, to revolutionize governments; for this reason, the Gospel is silent on this subject, while enforcing the general duties of the citizens under all governments *de facto*, whether revolutionary or otherwise; whether

despotic or democratic. That, under certain circumstances, the people, by which is meant the large majority, have a right to revolutionize a government, is conceded. Presbyterians have ever resisted the High Church and tory doctrine of the divine right of Kings, in the State ; and Prelates, in the Church. They stood, to a man, with the Patriots who achieved, under God, the independence of our beloved country ; they have maintained the principles of civil and religious liberty, at the hazard of life and fortune, in both hemispheres. The Presbyterians of Scotland, and the Puritans of England, were the founders of English liberty, by the admission of Hume himself, who hated them with infidel and tory extravagance. The right of a people to select their own form of government, a question entirely distinct from the fact of government, which is of necessity by a Divine Constitution, has ever been maintained by us as existing, not only in the nature of the case, but as warranted by the Word of God ; of which, the choice by the Hebrews of a King, and the rejection of their ancient democratic mode of government, which they received from the Supreme Lawgiver himself, is an example. This change was expressly allowed them at their desire, though with a plain intimation that their choice was a bad one. So the revolt of the ten tribes upon the declaration of Rehoboam, that he would govern them in a despotic and arbitrary sway, that "his little finger should be thicker than his father's loins," appears afterwards to have been sanctioned by the Most High ; who gave them Jeroboam for a King, and rent Israel for ever from the house of David and Solomon.

The right of revolution is a *civil right*, which can be properly exercised only, *by a decided majority, under circumstances of aggravated oppression and upon a reasonable assurance of success.* It is not for the Church, as such, to determine when a just ground for revolution exists, it belongs to the body of the people in their civil capacity. If, in the judgment, for example, of a great majority of the citizens of the United States, it would be better to abandon our Union ; if the South, in her exasperation against the North, for interference with her domestic relations, and in the vain hope to secure an increase of wealth and population corresponding with that of the free States, desire disunion ; if we of the North are unwilling to observe the guarantees of the Constitution, and think it worth while to abandon the advantages of the confederacy for the sake of making our territory a place of refuge for runaway slaves ; the Union will be dissolved by a revolution, the most disastrous the world ever saw. But while the Constitution remains, while the Government continues, let us observe the laws ; let us not justify murder and sedition ; and, least of all, let us not talk of a higher law, which absolves men from obedience to a Constitution which they have sworn to maintain. If there be any higher law, it is the law of resistance and revolution ; and the sooner this is understood and openly avowed, by the ultraists and fanatics, both North and South, the better for the country. The people of these United States are not likely, with their eyes open, to plunge into the gulf which disunionists are opening up beneath their feet ; and when the real designs of these men are seen, when they openly avow that a revolution is the end of their movement, we believe that they will be crushed under the weight of public indignation.

But, in regard to the question of a higher law, which we think we have demonstrated cannot be urged to annul the legislation of a state, in relation to any matter properly within its jurisdiction, it may be further replied, that it is not yet proved that the enactment or recognition of Slavery is within the powers divinely delegated to Governments ; that it is against the Supreme Law, and therefore all human legislation on the subject is inoperative and void. To this we reply, in the first place, that there are many evils in-

cident to the fallen condition of our race, such as War and Slavery, the existence of which is to be regretted, but which are necessarily, in the actual condition of mankind, the appropriate subjects of municipal regulation. A state must possess the right of self-defence in order to maintain its existence; this involves not only the authority of the Magistrate to punish criminals, but of the Government to declare war. This is clearly implied by the Apostle in the expression "he beareth not the sword in vain." But the state having this right may and do often abuse it by aggressive wars, the injustice of which, we have already seen, is no ground of forcible resistance to the civil authority. So the right of legislation in regard to servitude as a punishment for crime, or as a method for disposing of prisoners taken in war, has been exercised from the earliest ages and among all nations, and will hardly be denied by any intelligent and fair-minded man. The state having jurisdiction of the subject may, as in the waging of an aggressive war, abuse their power, by enacting unjust and oppressive laws of servitude; but is such legislation therefore inoperative and void? To affirm this, is to contradict the decision of the Apostle in his Epistle to the Romans, and to subvert every established principle, whether human or divine, on which rests the authority of civil government. In certain conditions of society Slavery is universal; it was recognized and regulated by law in all the free states of antiquity; it is the first movement towards civilization by savage and barbarous nations, to reduce their captives, taken in war, to Slavery, instead of subjecting them to torture and death. A recent traveller in the vast Empire of China, Mr. Lay, affirms that in that country the institution of Slavery is a positive blessing, as it prevents infanticide by the poorer classes, and provides for multitudes who must otherwise perish of want. That it exists in a mild form in China is admitted; but the question does not depend upon a comparison of the laws of different countries on this subject, but whether it is a condition of society which *can in any case be allowed*; whether civil governments have any authority or jurisdiction to enact laws upon the subject, or in any way to recognize or regulate it.

But there is higher authority for the determination of this question, than any thing we have yet suggested. The existence of domestic Slavery was expressly allowed, sanctioned, and regulated by the Supreme Lawgiver, in that divine economy which He gave the Hebrew state. The fact is open and undisputed; the record and proof of it are in the hands of every man who has in his possession a copy of the Bible. All the ingenuity and art of all the Abolitionists in the United States can never destroy the necessary conclusion of this admitted divine sanction of Slavery, that it is an institution which may lawfully exist, and concerning which Governments may pass laws, and execute penalties for their evasion or resistance.

To allege that there is a higher law, which makes slavery, *per se*, sinful, and that all legislation that protects the rights of masters, and enjoins the redelivery of the slave, is necessarily void and without authority, and may be conscientiously resisted by arms and violence, is an infidel position, which is contradicted by both Testaments;—which may be taught in the gospel of Jean Jacques Rousseau, and in the revelation of the Skeptics and Jacobins, who promised France, half a century ago, universal equality and fraternity; a gospel whose baptism was blood, a revelation whose sacrament was crime; but it cannot be found in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, or in the revelation of God's will to men. We do not mean to affirm that sincere and conscientious persons may not be found who have persuaded themselves that forcible resistance to slavery is obedience to God; and that in the increased light of the nineteenth century, the example of the Jewish economy, and the teachings

and practice of our Lord and the Apostles, are antiquated and of no binding force upon the consciences of men. Such honest but mistaken persons should remember, that if the institution of slavery is necessarily and from its nature sinful *now*, it must *always have been so*; as universal principles admit of no change, and their argument is, therefore, an impeachment of the benevolence of God, and a denial of the supreme authority of the Gospel, as a system of ethics. They must, to sustain their position, assume that we are wiser and better men than the Saviour and the Apostles, and that the government of God and the Gospel need revision and emendation. Such a conclusion is inevitable from the premises, and I would affectionately warn all who have named the name of Christ, and who have been betrayed by passion or sympathy into such a position, to see to it before they take the inevitable plunge, with the Garrison school, into the gulf of infidelity. I would respectfully entreat them to remember that this is not the first proclamation, "Lo, here is Christ, or there," which has proved a device of the adversary; that Jacobins, Fourierites, Communists, and Levellers of all sorts, reject the Gospel on the ground that it does not come up to *their standard* of liberty, equality and fraternity, and has no sufficiently comprehensive views of the rights of man. Those who preach the Gospel ought specially to remember that our race are apostate, and live under a remedial government; and that it is our mission to deal with the world as it is, and men as we find them, just as did the Saviour and the Apostles—remembering that here we have "no continuing city," and that the Gospel does not propose to us an equalization of human conditions in time; that "there remaineth a rest for the people of God," and to this, the Master of life and his Apostles pointed the rich and the poor, the high and the low, the bond and the free. They made it no part of their work to array the prejudices of one class against another; to discontent the slave with his position; or the citizen with the government; but treated all these things as of inferior consideration, compared with the hope of another and a better life, through the blood of atonement.

The comparative mildness of Hebrew slavery which is alleged, if it were true, is of no moment in the decision of the question before us; for it is not, whether American legislation on this subject be unwise and unjust, but whether the institution of slavery is necessarily sinful, and all legislation on the subject void for want of jurisdiction, and because of a higher law that prohibits its existence.

Domestic slavery, in this country, is older than the Constitution; it had existed for several generations before the Revolution. The people of the North, in their union with the slave States under a General Government, upon the adoption of a common Constitution, bound themselves to respect the institution of slavery as it then existed, so far as to deliver up fugitives to their masters. What has been said proves, we think, that such an arrangement was not void as being against a higher law, and consequently any legislation, by Congress, which fairly carries out this provision, and enforces this guarantee, is constitutional and lawful, and cannot be resisted upon any moral grounds. Whether the law is the *best* or the *worst* that could have been devised, is not the question here, nor is it really the question with the country; for it is the recognition of Slavery by the Constitution, and the right of recapture which it confers, which lies at the bottom of this agitation; all the rest is merely for effect, *vox et preterea nihil*, and those who recommend the violation of this law, would undoubtedly advise resistance to any enactment of Congress which would carry out the provision of the Constitution for the restoration of fugitive slaves.

It is somewhat singular that those whose consciences have been so much

aroused in regard to a higher law than the Constitution, should have forgotten, in their contemplation of moral and religious questions, that the observance of the compact between the North and the South falls within the moral rule which enjoins good faith, honesty, and integrity among men. Until this compact is rescinded by the power that made it, and by the parties who assented to it, its fulfilment is required by every principle of common honesty. With what pretence of right can the North say to the South, we will hold *you* to your part of the bargain ; *you must remain* in the Union, but we have conscientious scruples in regard to performing our part of the agreement. Is this the language of good faith and integrity ? Would it be thought honest in any private transaction or compact ? Is it for those who threaten the South with force in case of their resistance of Constitutional enactments—who are themselves advocating the violation of the laws which protect the rights secured to the slave States by the Constitution—to talk about higher laws and sensitive consciences ? Does the assertion, so often made, that there is no danger of disunion if the law of recapture is violated ; that the South are not strong enough to set up for themselves ; that they need the protection of the North to prevent a servile insurrection, add any thing to the moral beauty of this position ? What is this but the divine right of lawless force, the higher law of the strongest ? What is this but a disavowal of all regard for the claims of the weak ? In the words of a Highland song of the olden time,

“For why ? because the good old rule
Sufficeth them ; the simple plan,
That they must get who have the power,
And they must keep who can.”

May Vermont be permitted to pass laws to evade and prevent the execution of the legislation of Congress, and South Carolina threatened with investment by sea and land, by the army and navy of the United States, for doing the same thing ? Is this good faith between sovereign States ? Nay, is it common honesty among men ? “I speak to wise men, judge ye !”

If we are comparatively so much stronger than the South, as is alleged, is it magnanimous, is it just, for us to take advantage of their weakness, to violate their constitutional rights ? If they look upon the greater prosperity of the North with a degree of jealousy, and are the more sensitive on that account upon any appearance of a disregard, on our part, of the guarantees of the Constitution, there is the more reason for our forbearance ; especially when it is considered that in the very formation of the Union, there was an implied understanding that good will and forbearance should characterize the intercourse of the parties ; “that “Ephraim should not vex Judah ; or Judah, Ephraim.” Why should the Saxon obstinacy of the North and the Norman pride of the South be forever excited by these unhappy disputes in regard to slavery ; a question which time, and patience, and God’s providence can alone resolve ? The South are not so dependent upon us as we imagine ; in the case of a servile insurrection they would hardly look for aid, in the present state of things, from the North, and our constant allegations of their weakness constitute one ground of their dissatisfaction ; and one temptation to a separation, that they may prove to the North and the World that they can take care of themselves. They have the old Norman temper ; the blood of the Cavalier predominates over that of the Puritan in the southern States, and they would rather see their territory desolated with fire and sword than yield a single point of honor—than to feel, much less to acknowledge, that they are dependent upon the North for protection against their own slaves. It is evi-

dent that the great body of the people at the South are attached to the Union, and will not readily yield it ; but it is equally manifest that they have demagogues and traitors there, who desire to exercise dominion and lordship in a Southern Confederacy that shall extend from Virginia to Cuba ; who, like some at the North, would rather be Presidents and Secretaries by a division of the country, than to be out of office by its continued union.

If such men would boldly announce their design, if they would form an anti-union party, and present this question of a revolution in our government and an abandonment of our Constitution before the people, it would go far to dissipate the danger which threatens the Republic, and to quiet the perpetual agitations that are wearing out the strong bands that hold us together. For whatever allegations may be made that there is no danger of disunion ; whatever cries of " peace, peace," may be reiterated by men who are doing what they can to nullify their own predictions ; we may be assured there is treachery and danger all around us. The separation of large communions of Christians into Northern and Southern Churches was one of the first signs of evil omen to the country. But two of the leading Protestant denominations remain united.* I thank God that one of them is the Presbyterian Church, who are still one in form and fact, in heart and spirit, from New-York to New-Orleans, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, having long since met this question and settled it, finally and peacefully, upon Gospel principles. The constant agitation of the slavery question at the North, the untenable positions assumed, the fierce denunciations, the bitter revilings, the contumelious epithets which have been heaped upon our Southern brethren and all who would not consent to unite in a crusade against them, are producing their legitimate fruits of alienation, distrust, and hatred. If no positive proof exists of a conspiracy among certain hot-headed and ambitious demagogues at the South, to dismember the Union ; that a Southern Confederacy may be formed which will make them all great men ; yet, it is manifest that such a design has been formed, either with or without concert, among a class of abstractionists there, who are co-operating with the abolitionists, at the North, to agitate and inflame the public mind, until a revolution is inevitable. The recent settlement of the vexed sectional questions, which was hailed by the country with confidence and hope, is sought to be disturbed not only by denunciation, but by a violent resistance of the laws enacted, and this, too, before sufficient time has elapsed to test them. Every kind of phantom is conjured up ; visions of free men forcibly hurried into slavery ; appalling pictures of cruelty and injustice are continually exciting the public mind ; though but six captures are said to have been made under the fugitive slave law since its passage, and with two exceptions it is believed the alleged fugitives have been discharged or redeemed. If those who harrow up the sensibilities of innocent and ignorant persons by these dreadful imaginations, are sincere in the fears which they express, that free persons of color are likely to be enslaved by the existing law, it shows how utterly fanaticism disregards facts ; if they are opposed to the redelivery of fugitive slaves under the provision of the Constitution, the only honest position they can take is to declare at once and openly for a dissolution of the Union, or the subjugation of the South, by force of arms, to the North.

Before we leave this subject, we ought to notice the probable results of a dissolution of the Union. What its advantages have been, are matters of history and experience. Under God, the Union has made us a great and

* The Protestant Episcopal and the Presbyterian.

prosperous people. We have maintained peace at home, and commanded respect abroad ; our country has been the asylum of the oppressed of every land, the permanency of our institutions has been hailed as the last hope of freedom for the world. Every State has preserved its local sovereignty, while obedient to the general law. Every citizen has enjoyed the largest liberty consistent with the preservation of order, and dwelt under his "own vine and fig-tree, with none to molest him or make him afraid." We may say with the Psalmist, "the lines have fallen unto us in pleasant places, and God has given us a goodly heritage."

On the other hand, all the disastrous consequences which must flow from disunion, are known only to Him who sees the end from the beginning. One thing is certain, no benefit can flow from a separation of the States, to that unhappy race about whom this whole controversy exists. No possible or conceivable advantage can arise to them, if the Union were sundered to-morrow. Their condition at the North would not be improved, their state at the South would be rendered so far worse, as an increased severity of legislation might be required to prevent their escape to an enemy's frontier. If a small increase of the number of those who escape to the North should be secured, which is doubtful, the question arises, and it is a grave and unsettled one, whether their residence with us is a substantial improvement of their condition. The forms of freedom are of little consequence to him who is made by color and caste a "hewer of wood and a drawer of water." That the colored race are capable of elevation I have always maintained—just as capable as the white, if they can be made to possess the same advantages ; but I am fully persuaded that colonization can alone secure those advantages, and give to the African that which alone makes personal freedom and free institutions valuable. In any view of the subject, the agitations and divisions of the country on the question of slavery, and the revolution which may result from them, *are of no conceivable consequence* to those about whose interest the controversy exists. A more unprofitable and inconsequential abstraction was never before made to disturb the peace, and hazard the existence of a great Empire.

With reference to the positive evils of a revolution, it is the opinion of the most profound statesmen in the country, that a division of the Union must result in a perpetual war between the two sections. This agrees with all the facts of History, and the conclusions of the most profound observation upon human nature. Peace would be impossible under the circumstances. A line of fire would mark the boundary between the free and slave States, from the Atlantic to the Mississippi ; from the Mississippi to the Pacific. The blackened roof-trees of all human habitations, for miles on either side of this accursed line, would demonstrate the bitterness of a conflict between men of the same blood, and verify the declaration of Scripture that "the contentions of brethren are like the bars of a castle." Across the entire continent, the boundaries of the two governments would be marked by conflagration, rapine and violence. Armed plunderers, with whom war would be the excuse for murder and robbery, would make a desert of the country adjacent on either side, which would soon be known over the whole world by two names, ACELDAMA and GOLGOTHA, a field of blood—a place of skulls. There are no visionaries so wild as those who dream that this vast Empire can be disunited peacefully, or that peace can ever be maintained between the North and the South, under separate governments, with all the old memories, the bitter prejudices, the unavoidable rivalries, the unceasing disputes of jurisdiction, with the mouth of the Mississippi in one territory and its sources in the other, and with the ominous slave question embittered a thousand-fold by the dismemberment of the country. If, in this unnatural contest, the North should

prevail over the South, it would be by making a desert of the territory from the Potomac to the Gulf of Mexico, and by the destruction of both the races who now occupy it ; a victory barren of glory—the jest of tyrants, and the scorn of the world.

But the spirit of disunion, once evoked, may extend its malign influences until, by the supposition, having accomplished the ruin of the South, the states at the North should divide, and each set up for itself, and, like the petty governments, or rather anarchies, of South America, command neither respect abroad nor obedience at home.

The beginnings of strife are like the letting out of waters, and to this miserable conclusion at last, these unhappy divisions may bring us. It is an old adage, that those whom God would destroy he first makes mad ; and it would seem that nothing short of judicial blindness can lead to the further agitation of a question fraught with ruin to our beloved country, and to the hopes of political freedom over the entire globe. The dismemberment of this country will be the death-blow of its prosperity. Our rights will be no more regarded abroad or our laws at home, for our strength will be exhausted in our domestic wars ; property, both at the North and South, will immediately and decidedly depreciate in value ; all confidence in the stability of our institutions will be destroyed ; and Despots will hold a jubilee over the grave of the American Constitution. Worst of all, this disastrous event will have been brought about by no foreign war, by no struggle with the civil or religious despotisms of the world ; by no honorable resistance to foreign interference ; but by the madness of men ready to sacrifice to one idea, and that an impracticable one, to one principle, and that a false one, the legacy of Freedom and Union which we hold from our fathers, and which we are bound to transmit to our children by every consideration of patriotism, by every obligation of religion ; and failing to do which, both Earth and Heaven will cry out against us, as false to the trust committed to us by our noble ancestry ; false to our allegiance and our oaths ; false to our children and posterity ; false to our religion and to God, who has committed to our keeping the ark of civil and religious liberty, for the benefit of our race, to be held as a sacred deposit for the world. The plea of sympathy with the colored race, in view of their degraded condition, however suitable such sympathy may be, and demanded by Him who hath made of one blood all nations and races, to dwell together on the face of the earth, will never avail to justify an agitation which is useless to them and ruinous to us. A man who should expose a whole community to destruction, under the plea of delivering one of its members from servitude, or who should fire his neighbor's dwelling for the same purpose, at the risk of a conflagration which must consume both master and slave, and even expose his own house and his own children to a miserable death, could hardly be counted a philanthropist, or find a justification of his conduct in any abstract question of human rights. I would that I had a voice to penetrate every habitation in this great Empire, to reach every ear from ocean to ocean, from Maine to Florida—to entreat my countrymen to pause from a controversy from which there will soon be no retreat, and of which, if protracted, there can be but one issue—the dissolution of the Union and the ruin of the Republic. By their duty to God and to the Government, I would implore them to be obedient to the laws ; by their regard for their children, by their respect for the interests of our common humanity, I would beseech them to take care of the Commonwealth, than which there is no higher law for the Christian citizen. I would appeal to the North and the South, by their common ancestry, by the august memories of the revolutionary struggle, by the bones of their fathers which lie mingled together at

Yorktown and Saratoga, at Trenton and Charlestown, by the farewell counsels of the immortal Washington, to lay aside their animosities and to remember that they are brethren. I would remind them that the Union has given us the blessings which we enjoy—that under its Flag our victories have been won ; our borders extended ; our wealth and population increased ; our ships respected in every port of every sea, until our national progress has excited the admiration, or aroused the envy, of all the Nations and Potentates of the earth. I would warn them of that abyss of ruin which fanaticism and treason are opening beneath them ; into which they would plunge our present fortunes and our future hopes. I would beseech them to stand by the Union, to obey the laws, to frown upon agitation, in this crisis of our beloved country. I would admonish them that failing to do this, failing to sustain the free institutions, and to regard the mutual compacts which we received from our fathers, we may expect as a consequence the curses of posterity, the contempt of the world, and the judgments of God. May the Ruler of nations avert from us these impending calamities. May the Holy Trinity, in whom our fathers trusted, give us, as a people, the spirit of wisdom and understanding and of a sound mind. May we hereafter on occasions like the present have a new motive of thanksgiving and praise in the proofs of the peaceful settlement of all sectional controversies—in the fact that the Ship of State, long tossed by tempests and threatened with destruction by conflicting and angry elements, is at last sailing in a calm sea, with a law-abiding crew, **AND THE FLAG OF THE UNION NAILED TO HER MASTS.**

THE END.

A REVIEW

OF

REV. DOCTOR LORD'S SERMON

ON

THE HIGHER LAW,

IN ITS APPLICATION TO

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE BILL.

at Kew-Forest
BY REV. WILLIAM C. WISNER. 1850-80

READ, PONDER, DECIDE; FOR "AS A MAN THINKETH SO IS HE;" THAT IS,
A MAN IS NO BETTER THAN HIS PRINCIPLES.

BUFFALO:
T. AND M. BUTLER.

1851.

to
n-
ne,
ons

is
ful

TO THE READER.

THE following Review is given to the public at the solicitation of a few ministerial brethren, in whom the author has the utmost confidence. It was undertaken with no love for the spirit of controversy, but with an earnest desire to subserve the cause of truth. All we ask for it, is a careful and candid perusal. The reader is under no obligation to adopt our views on this or any other subject, any farther than they correspond with the revealed Will of God.

REVIEW.

THE present is a time of great interest to every American citizen. It is a time when subjects of the greatest importance to our wide-spread and growing Republic are being re-investigated and discussed, with reference to their bearing upon the welfare of the nation, and their relation to that system of ethics which has its foundation in the word of God.

The most exciting, and, we may add, at present the most important of these subjects is that of American slavery. The fact that a system of slavery, involving the chattel principle, is interwoven with the very texture of our political constitution, that, with all its horrors, it is legalized and exists to a large extent in the midst of a nation who pride themselves upon their attachment to liberty and the doctrine of equal rights, has been considered by a large portion of our citizens, a *burning shame*, and has also been our *reproach* among the civilized nations of the earth.

For a long period, we were denied the right of discussing the subject in our halls of legislation, and respectful

petitions, signed by thousands of citizens, praying our rulers to consider it and adopt the wisest and best means for the final removal of the evil, were without ceremony laid on the table, as unworthy the serious attention of so grave and dignified a body as the American Congress. But, for the last two years, this subject has claimed the attention of the people and their representatives in every part of the land. That it should produce great and general excitement, was to be expected. But that this excitement will in the end prove disastrous to the country or to the slave, we do not believe. Much has been written on both sides which is to be regretted; but surely not more than might have been anticipated, when we consider the circumstances and heat of the discussion.

It has, however, developed one fact for which the author of these pages was not prepared, and which has surprised not merely himself, but many of his brethren. It is the fact that so many northern ministers are prepared to become the apologists of slavery, and have endeavored, in every possible way, to torture the Bible into their service.

We were not surprised at the appointment, by a certain class of politicians assembled at Castle garden, of a *Union Safety Committee*, whose ostensible business it is to see that the *Union be not dissolved*, but who are in fact engaged in catering to the worst passions of Southern politicians, and doing what they can to perpetuate the "peculiar institution" of slavery. But we were surprised to find them becoming a *sermon publishing Committee*,—making the press and the post-office department groan under the weight of productions from eminent northern divines,—

and, as if they begrudged the revenue accruing from the postage on these productions, getting them franked by various members of Congress, and sending them by thousands, free of charge, to every part of the country.

One of these franked sermons is now on our table; and as they all bear a marked resemblance to each other, showing that they belong to the same family, perhaps we cannot better express our views upon the general positions they assume, than by a candid and careful review of the one before us. It is a sermon delivered by Rev. Dr. Lord, of Buffalo, to the people of his charge, on our last Thanksgiving day. The title of the discourse is well chosen to represent its contents. It is entitled, "*The Higher Law in its Application to the Fugitive Slave Bill.*" Its object is to show that, upon the subject of slavery, there is no higher law than human constitutions, and that the decisions of government, upon this subject at least—no matter how oppressive and unrighteous—are, and ought to be, final, and should be submitted to and carried out by the citizen.

The passage of Scripture selected, from which to deduce such a doctrine, appears to us peculiarly unfortunate. It is Matt. 22: 17–21. The history of this passage is familiar to every reader of the Bible. After a consultation of the Pharisees how they might entangle Christ in his talk, they sent unto him certain of their disciples, with the Herodians, to ask him whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Caesar? This question was wisely selected to lead him into difficulty. An answer, either way, was fraught with danger. Should he answer in the affirmative, he would be in danger from his own countrymen, who, at that time,

were the conquered vassals of the Roman Empire, and hated, with a perfect hatred, the Roman tribute. Should he answer in the negative, he would be in danger of being arraigned at Cæsar's judgment bar, for promulgating seditious and treasonable doctrines. Being guided by wisdom from on high, he was at no loss how to extricate himself from this difficulty. Instead of giving a direct answer, he asked to see the tribute money. They brought him a penny. He inquired, "Whose is this image and superscription?" They say unto him, Cæsar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." This was in no proper or strict sense an answer to the question proposed, but a most wise and judicious evasion of it. Christ, by this answer, did not say that it was right to pay tribute to Cæsar. The Pharisees did not so understand him—if they had, it was all they wanted. Nor did he deny the right to pay tribute—if he had, that was all they desired. He answered them, by stating the general principle, that they should render to all their dues—to Cæsar what belonged to him, and to God what belonged to him. Nor does this answer distinguish between what belongs to Cæsar and what to God. If it does, the line of distinction must be, that whatever bears the image of Cæsar belongs to him, and whatever bears the image of God belongs to him—and surely this line would subvert entirely the doctrine of the discourse we are considering. Suppose the inquiry had been, "Master, is it right for men to hold their fellow men in bondage? Is slavery right?" He replies, "show me a slave." They bring him one. He then asks, "Whose is this image and

superscription?" What answer must they give? Could they say that it was Cæsar's? Would they not be compelled to admit that it was God's? Is not the slave a man? And does he not belong to that race who were created in the *image of God*? If so, he might reply: "Render therefore unto God the things that are God's, and unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. Slaves bear the image of God. They belong to him and not to the government. And government have no right to strip them of their humanity, and, by *chattelizing them*, to place them among brutes."

But we will pass from the text to consider the sentiments maintained in the sermon itself. We are told in the introduction, that "it does not require very great discernment to see, that the continued agitation of the vexed question of slavery, must, in the end, sever the bonds between the free and the slave states, or render them not worth preserving." And has it come to this, that we of the North must hold our tongues and lay aside our pens on the subject of slavery, or the union will be dissolved? We have heard such threats from Southern politicians until we have ceased to be alarmed. Nor do we believe that our fears will be very much stirred by their *repetition* by a certain class of northern divines. The subject of slavery, like other great subjects, should be discussed in a dignified, manly, calm and unheated manner; but that it will continue to be discussed until it is thoroughly sifted—and, if possible, *sifted* from the *Republic*—we have no doubt.

There is another sentiment contained in our author's introduction, to which we would invite special attention —

it may be of service in the after review. "The acknowledged principle," he says, "that the law of God is *supreme*, and when in direct conflict with any *mere human enactment*, renders it *nugatory*, has been used to justify an abandonment of the compromises of the constitution." While we do not wish to use this "*acknowledged principle*" for any such purpose, we are gratified to see it so plainly stated, for we think we can find a far better and more important end for which it may be used. Here is a distinct admission that the law of God is *supreme*—that it is *above all human enactments*, and that when human enactments come in *conflict with it*, it renders them *nugatory*. Here, then, we have found a law *somewhat higher* than the constitution, unless our author is prepared to take the ground that our federal constitution is *not a mere human enactment*. The federal constitution is a higher law than the constitutions of the several states. And why a higher law? Because it renders *nugatory* any provisions of these constitutions which conflict with its provisions. And upon the same principle, according to our author's own showing, the law of God is a *higher law* than the federal constitution, or any enactment of Congress.

Let us place this admission by the side of the main and leading position of the sermon, and see to what conclusion it will inevitably lead. "We take the ground," says our author, "that the action of civil governments, within their *appropriate jurisdiction*, is *final* and *conclusive* upon the citizen; and that to plead a higher law to justify disobedience to a human law, the subject matter of which is *within the cognizance* of the state, is to *reject the authority of God himself*;" that is, the citizen is bound

most scrupulously to obey every enactment of government, no matter how *unrighteous* and *oppressive*, provided, *only*, it is upon a subject upon which government has a *right to act at all*. This is a most sweeping assertion. It admits of but one exception, and that is, where the subject of the action is not within the "appropriate jurisdiction" of the government. The only plea, then, which a tender conscience has a right to put in, against the action of any human government is, a *want of jurisdiction*. It is not allowed to plead that the government has acted wrong in a matter where it has any right to act at all. The only plea that can be made in justification for not obeying a law, is, that it is upon a subject over which the government has no jurisdiction, and, consequently, no right to act in any manner.

The position previously taken is, that it is an "*acknowledged principle* that the law of God is *supreme*, and, when in direct conflict with any mere human law, renders it *nugatory*." What is the meaning of "*nugatory*?" If it means any thing in this place, it must mean that, under such circumstances, the law has *no binding force*. Upon whom has it no binding force? Evidently upon those on whom it would have had a binding force had it not come in conflict with the *supreme* law of God, and all such must be the citizens, or subjects, of the government by whom the law is enacted. The doctrine here taught is, that a mere human enactment may so conflict with the supreme law of God as to be rendered *nugatory*, and thus lose its binding force upon the citizen. But we are taught by the after and main position, that no mere human enactment can be rendered *nugatory* by the supreme law

of God, so as not to be final and binding upon the citizen, *unless it be upon a subject where government has no right to legislate.* We do not pretend that these positions contradict each other; but, taken together, they reduce the matter to a single point, viz: that governments, in all cases where they have *any* authority, have *supreme* authority, *notwithstanding the law of God.* Now this must arise from one of two causes: either God has *no authority whatever* in matters belonging to government, or the authority of government is *superior* to that of God. But if God has no authority in matters belonging to government, either it is true that he never had any such authority, or it is true that, at some time, he has relinquished this authority in favor of the governments of the earth. Nor are we left in the dark as to which of these positions is assumed by our learned author. He says distinctly, that, "to plead a higher law to justify disobedience to a human law, the subject matter of which is within the cognizance of the state, is to *reject the authority of God himself.*" What is this but saying that God, in all such matters, has relinquished his jurisdiction to the state, so that, in regard to them, there is no appeal from its decisions to himself; and that the citizen who dares to attempt such an appeal, is *guilty* of rejecting the authority and appointment of God? We should like to have our author inform us when God made such a relinquishment in favor of the governments of the earth? when he gave them supreme jurisdiction in all matters within their cognizance, so that there is no appeal from their decisions to himself? We trust that he will not shrink from a legitimate consequence of this doctrine, viz:

that governments, within the sphere of their action, *can do no wrong*. The catechism of his church teaches that *sin is the transgression of the law of God*; and if God, in all matters belonging to government, has relinquished his authority, so that, by his appointment, the decisions of government, in all such matters, are *supreme, final*—under *all* circumstances *binding*; then, surely, government *can do no wrong*, unless it attempts to meddle with what does not concern it. In England the doctrine that the king can do no wrong is held to be a fiction in law; but, it seems, that in America, among a certain class of divines, this doctrine has become a *stern reality*. They have come to agree, with a single exception, with the infidel Hobbes on the foundation of right and wrong. He held that the *civil law was its sole foundation—that whatever government decided to be right, was right, and whatever it decided to be wrong, was wrong*. The only difference between Hobbes and these divines, on this point, is, that while he makes the position universal, they limit it to those things which come legitimately under the cognizance of government.

But perhaps it will be said, that we have misunderstood our author—that what he means is, to place government between God and the subject, so that while governments are subject to God, and held responsible by him for their wrong decisions—decisions which come in *conflict* with his *supreme law*—the subject is *not* held responsible for obeying and carrying out these decisions; yea, he is under obligation to obey them. And can it be possible, that our author intends to teach that the subject is under obligation to obey human laws which are *in conflict with the Divine*

law?—that while governments will be called to an account for enacting such laws, the subject is not only innocent, but in the discharge of a most solemn duty when he yields obedience to them? If so, what becomes of his “acknowledged principle that the law of God is supreme, and when in direct conflict with any mere human enactment renders it nugatory?” In what sense is it *nugatory*, if, while it is in conflict with the Divine law, the citizen is under obligation to obey it?

That we have not mistaken the views of our author upon this point, will further appear from the following quotations:—“The decisions of government upon matters within their jurisdiction, though they may be erroneous, are yet, from the necessity of the case, *absolute*.” “But the position we have taken, that the decisions of government are *final* in cases where they have jurisdiction, even when mistaken or oppressive,” &c. “But in regard to the question of a *higher law*, which we think we have demonstrated, cannot be urged to annul the legislation of a state, in relation to any matter properly within its jurisdiction, it may be further replied, that it is not yet proved that the enactment or recognition of slavery is within the powers divinely delegated to governments—that it is against the supreme law, and therefore all human legislation is inoperative and void.” It seems to us that there can be no mistake in regard to the teaching of these paragraphs. They certainly teach that the decisions of government in all matters where it has *any* authority, are *final* and *binding* upon the citizen,—that in all such matters there is no appeal to a *higher law*; and that the only way in which the decisions of government can come in conflict with the

Divine law, and thus be rendered “inoperative and void,” is *by being upon subjects which are not properly within its jurisdiction*. It will be seen, also, by the last paragraph, that our author holds that both “the enactment” and “recognition of slavery” are properly within the jurisdiction government,—that it has a right, not only to recognize and regulate slavery where it exists, but also to *enact it into existence* where it does not; and that this right is *absolute, entirely independent of a higher law*. Here, then, we have one of the things which belong *exclusively* to government, and over which God has *relinquished all control*.

But let us inquire more at large what are the things which God has relinquished to government, and what the things which he has retained to himself? This inquiry becomes one of vast importance. We surely ought to know what limit God has set to his own authority; and in what particulars the decisions of human governments are *final, absolute, supreme*, not subject to the *Divine law*. We are gratified to be able to answer this inquiry in the very words of our author: “Governments have jurisdiction over men in all affairs which belong peculiarly to the present life,—in all the temporal relations which bind societies, communities, and families together, in respect to all rights of persons and property, and their enforcement by penalties.” Here, then, are the things which belong to the governments of the earth, and over which their authority is supreme, and their enactments subject to no higher law.

The things which belong to God, and over which He has retained authority, are stated as follows:—“In regard to

his own worship, and the manner in which we are to approach him, the Supreme Governor has given full and minute directions. He has revealed Himself, his attributes, and the great principles of his government, which constitute the doctrines of Christianity; and has conferred upon no human authority the right to interfere, by adding to or taking from them. **IN THE THINGS THAT BELONG TO HIMSELF**, God exercises *sole* and absolute jurisdiction, and has, in regard to them, appointed *no inferior or delegated authority*." Here are some pretty broad statements which it may not be amiss to examine with a degree of minuteness. We are told that "governments have jurisdiction over men *in all affairs* which belong *peculiarly to the present life*." What does our author mean by "*affairs which belong peculiarly to the present life*?" Does he mean affairs which terminate with this life? If so, he would give to government the ordinances of religion, such as a preached Gospel, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, &c. Surely this cannot be his meaning. Does he mean affairs, the influence of which terminates with this life, and which have no bearing upon the life to come? We think he would have great difficulty to find any such affairs; and we must conclude that this is not his meaning. Does he mean affairs which are not peculiarly religious, and which were instituted more especially for the convenience and happiness of man here, than with reference to a preparation for eternity? This would seem to be his meaning, and it is the more evident when taken in connection with what immediately follows: "*in all temporal relations which bind societies, communities, and families together, in respect to all rights of person and property*." Here "*tem-*

poral relations" seem to be used as opposed to *spiritual relations*, by which we suppose our author intends relations which belong peculiarly to the Christian Church, and have especially to do with the Christian religion. And this is still further evident when we consider what things he defines as belonging to God. He limits these to "His own worship, and the manner in which we are to approach Him,"—to "the great principles of His government which constitute the doctrines of Christianity." Now if he means any thing by this distinction and limitation, he must mean that all matters which relate *peculiarly* to the church and religion belong to God, and *all other matters* to government.

To secure greater distinctness we will place in opposite columns the things which belong to God, and those which belong to government.

Things which belong to God.

"His own worship and the manner in which we are to approach Him."

"The great principles of His government which constitute the doctrines of Christianity."

Things which belong to Government.

"All affairs which belong peculiarly to the present life. All the temporal relations which bind societies, communities, and families together: all rights of person, and of property, and their enforcement by penalties."

Surely God has been very benevolent, and has relinquished to human governments *much the largest half* of His authority.

It should be recollected that in all matters belonging to government, its decisions are final and binding upon the citizen, and there is no appeal to a *higher law*. The sole and supreme authority in all these matters, rests with the government. Its decisions, let them be what they may, cannot be rendered *nugatory* by the *Divine law*. God has relinquished all his jurisdiction in these matters to government; and what remains for the citizen is *implicit obedi-*

ence ; for “to plead a higher law to justify disobedience to a human law, the subject matter of which is within the cognizance of the state, is to reject the authority of God himself.” Why is it “to reject the authority of God himself?” Evidently because God has relinquished all jurisdiction in such matters to human governments, and requires implicit obedience on the part of the subject. And as God has nothing to do with matters belonging to government, so government has nothing to do with matters belonging to God — they are *entirely independent of each other*. That is, God has placed himself right where the Italians have been endeavoring to place the Pope,—he has relinquished all civil authority, and is contenting himself with *mere ecclesiastical rule*. Surely “Jacobins, Fourierites, Communists, and Levelers of all sorts,” have never embraced or published a doctrine more alarming than this.

Our author even goes so far as to inform us that upon those subjects which belong to him, God has never delegated any authority to man. His language is so direct and explicit that evasion is impossible. He says, and places the sentiment in glaring capitals, that “**IN THE THINGS THAT BELONG TO HIMSELF, GOD EXERCISES SOLE AND ABSOLUTE JURISDICTION, AND HAS IN REGARD TO THEM, APPOINTED NO INFERIOR OR DELEGATED AUTHORITY.***”

* Should our author contend that he means *legislative* jurisdiction and authority, we reply, 1st. He does not say so. He says, “*sole and absolute jurisdiction*,” not *legislative* jurisdiction. He says, “*no inferior or delegated authority*,” not *legislative authority*—and surely a doctor of divinity ought to know *how to say what he means*, and not say one thing and mean another. 2d. Had he said, *legislative* jurisdiction and authority, it is *untrue*. God claims at least some rights in the Sabbath, and in the subjects of murder and theft ; He has taken the

We would ask our author, whether the parent has any authority over his child in matters of religion? If so, from whence does he derive this authority? Certainly not from the government, for such matters do not belong to it; and as certainly not from God, for in matters belonging to him he delegates no authority. We would ask again, whether the Sessions, Presbyteries, and General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church have any authority? If so, from whence have they derived this authority? Not from the state, for it has no authority in such matters; not from God, for in matters belonging to him he delegates no authority. From whence comes our author's authority as a minister of the gospel and the pastor of his people? By his own showing it can come neither from the state, nor from God. From whence, then, has he derived it?

We would also inquire of our author whether the Sabbath belongs to God, or to government? If to the former, the government has nothing whatever to do with it; it has not even the right to enact laws to enforce its sanctity. If to the latter, then government may pass laws requiring its violation; and as such laws are *final*, the citizen is *bound to obey*.

Marriage, according to our author, belongs to government and not to God, for surely it is one of those "temporal relations which bind families together"—and if so,

liberty to legislate upon them amid the awful solemnities of Sinai—and yet no sensible man will deny that human governments have the right to legislate upon the same subjects, but they must take care that their legislation does not conflict with the legislation of God.

The position of our author, in any aspect, is false as the Koran, and if adopted by the ministers of the gospel, would make more infidels than the united influence of "levelers of all sorts."

government has a right to abrogate it, and to legalize universal concubinage—and its decisions will be *final*, and *imperious* upon the citizen, there is no appeal to a *higher law*. So government might enact that every man should have two wives; and even here there is *no appeal*—the subject is *bound to obey*. But perhaps our author will take the ground that marriage is a spiritual relation and belongs to God. It will then follow that governments have no right to meddle with it—they have no right to enforce or to regulate it. And it becomes a grave question whether any man, or class of men has the right or authority to solemnize marriage,—for it belongs to God, and in all matters belonging to Him He *delegates no authority*.

To whom do those rights, the violation of which is denominated *theft* and *murder*, belong? to God, or to government? If to God, then government has nothing to do with them. If to government, then God has nothing to do with them. And if government should think proper to legalize theft, and murder, its decisions upon these subjects would be *final*,—there would be no appeal to a *higher law*. Should our author take the ground that the protection of human life belongs to God, and not to government, and should he cite in support of this opinion the fact that God has fixed the death penalty to murder, with which penalty human governments have no right to interfere, we would then ask, who has authority to execute this penalty upon the offender? Not the government;—for in things belonging to God it has no jurisdiction. Not any man or angel delegated by God for that purpose,—for “IN THE THINGS BELONGING TO HIMSELF GOD EXER-

CISES SOLE AND ABSOLUTE JURISDICTION, AND HAS, IN REGARD TO THEM, APPOINTED NO INFERIOR OR DELEGATED AUTHORITY."

We do not see but that we must wait for God to execute this penalty in person: and we have a reasonable assurance that if we wait long enough, he will do it; for in all probability, at some point in the future, the murderer will die.

Our author feels bound to admit that revolution is a *civil* right. "The right of revolution," he says, "is a civil right, which can be properly exercised *only by a decided majority, under circumstances of aggravated oppression, and upon a reasonable assurance of success.*" Here the civil right of revolution under certain circumstances is admitted. But from whence comes this right? Not from God; for *civil rights* do not belong to him. Not from the government; for it would be absurd to suppose the government to confer upon the citizen a right to *subvert itself*.

But let us view this subject of revolution in the light of our author's interpretation of Romans xiii: 1 and 2. "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." We are told that this passage teaches that in all matters within their cognizance "the powers that be" are supreme,—and to resist them, let their course be ever so erroneous and oppressive, is to resist the *ordinance of God*. If this be true, on what does our author predicate the right of civil revolution? Such a revolution is certainly resistance to "the powers that

be," and if to resist them under any such circumstances is to resist the *ordinance* of God, yea, even "*to reject the authority of God himself*," on what does he predicate this right? Does he predicate it on the fact that the government has been guilty of "aggravated oppression?" Surely this can form no just cause for resistance, for we are taught by him, that in all matters over which government has jurisdiction, its decisions are final, and subject to no HIGHER LAW. Does he predicate it on the fact that a decided majority are in its favor? Then it follows that while minorities are forbidden to resist the ordinance of God, "decided majorities," may resist it, and the sin consists not in the act, but in the want of numbers on the part of those engaged in it. Does he predicate it on the fact that there is "*a reasonable assurance of success*?" It follows then that while it is unlawful to resist the ordinance of God, without "*a reasonable assurance of success*," with such assurance resistance is entirely lawful, and the sin consists, not in committing the act, but in committing it without "*a reasonable assurance of success*." We have often heard it said, that "assurance is every thing," but after all, we did not think it was quite as much, as this makes it to be. Is it not evident that the passage under consideration, has been misconceived, and misapplied by our author, and that it was never intended to teach, so absurd and untenable a doctrine as he has endeavored to sustain by it? But here the inquiry arises, if our author has mistaken the import of this passage, what does it mean? This and similar passages teach something, and what do they teach? They declare government to be in some sense an ordinance of God, and enjoin subjection, and obe-

dience to it. In what sense is government an ordinance of God, and how far are we bound to obey its requirements? These questions, we shall endeavor to answer, and if we fail to satisfy the reader, we have the consolation, that there is a "higher law" than our opinion, and that he is under no obligation to adopt it as his own.

That the reader may have them distinctly before his mind, we will here insert the two principal passages upon this subject. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be, are ordained (ordered) of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist, shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath, upon him that doeth evil. Whereupon we must needs be subject, not only for wrath (for fear of the penalty,) but also for conscience sake." Rom. XIII: 1-5. "Submit yourself to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the King, as supreme; or unto Governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." 1. Peter II: 13, 14. In the first passage, upon the sentence "The powers that be are ordained (ordered) of God," the learned Bloomfield remarks, "By this it is only meant, that they are permitted to hold the office they hold, by the disposing Providence of God; though mediately appointed,

by the authority, and invested with it, by the consent of man."

It is worthy of notice, that while Paul calls "the powers that be," or the then existing government, an ORDINANCE OF GOD, Peter calls it an ORDINANCE OF MAN. Nor are these statements contradictory. They were made of different aspects of the same thing. It is true of an existing government, that in one sense it is an ordinance of God, and in another sense an ordinance of man. For as Bishop Sanderson very justly observes, "the *substance* of the power of every magistrate is the *ordinance of God* ; but the *specification* of the *circumstances thereto belonging*, as in regard of places, persons, titles, continuance, jurisdiction, subordination, and the rest, is a *human ordinance introduced by custom or positive law*."

In the sentence of Paul "Whosoever resisteth the power," &c., the word rendered "resisteth" is *antitassomenos*. It is used but five times in the New Testament, viz. in Acts 18 : 6, "And when they *opposed themselves*, and blasphemed ;" in James 4 : 6, "Resist the Devil and he will flee from thee ;" in James 5 : 6, "Ye have condemned and killed the just, and he doth not *resist* you ;" in 1 Peter 5 : 5, "For God *resisteth* the proud," &c., and in the passage now under consideration. It will at once be perceived that in every instance, it implies *determined* and *active* hostility. Prof. Robinson renders it "to array oneself against." Bloomfield translates this sentence, "He who sets himself in array against." Every Greek scholar knows that this word has a far more active signification than can possibly be implied in merely omitting to obey the precept of the law, and as a consequence, submitting to suffer the penalty. It would seem then that the submission enjoined in this

passage, is, that which is opposed to *arraying one's self against* the Government. It does not necessarily imply obedience to law in every supposable case. But in every case it does imply obedience, or a peaceable submission to suffer the penalty. They to whom the Apostle wrote, were to yield implicit obedience, when they conscientiously could; and in those cases where the human law conflicted with the law of God, so that, with them, obedience was morally impossible, they were to submit to suffer the penalty. This subjection the Apostle would have them render not mainly through fear of the penalty, but "for conscience sake." And surely it could not be for *conscience sake*, if the subjection required included obedience to a law which conflicted with the Divine law, and thus did violence to an enlightened and tender conscience.

There was great need that the early converts to christianity should be instructed and exhorted on the duty of subjection to rulers : for the spirit of sedition, against their Roman conquerors, was deeply seated in the hearts of the Jews, and the Gentile converts were in danger of feeling that they were under no obligation to be in subjection to heathen magistrates. The Apostles, to guard them against sedition and misrule, enjoined submission to "the powers that be," as to an ordinance or appointment of God. They taught that Government was ordained for the good of the people, and that the magistracy was appointed for the punishment of evil doers, and "for the praise of them that do well." For, says Paul, "Rulers are not a terror to good works but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power ? Do that which is good and thou shalt have praise of the same : For he is the minister of God to thee for

good. But if thou do that which is evil be afraid ; for he beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." This is a graphic description of the end or design of all government, and of what rulers are ordained or appointed to be. But when they pervert the ends of justice, and enact wicked laws, which ought not to be obeyed, the subject, up to the time when a revolution becomes expedient or necessary, must submit to suffer the penalty.

Government, when viewed separate from its forms, is of universal obligation. Its necessity is founded in the nature of things. It is so ordained of God that society cannot exist without it. Society can no more do without government, than the individual can do without food. But it should always be borne in mind that government is ordained for the people, and not the people for government. As a man eats to live, instead of living to eat, so the people are governed that they may exist, instead of existing to be governed.

God has so far ordained a form to government, that the last cannot exist without the first. It is as impossible for government to exist without a form, as it is for society to exist without government. But God has never so ordained the form of government, as to make any *particular* form binding upon the nations of the earth. We do not believe in the *Divine* right of either kings or republics. God has left the particular form of government to the choice of the people, and the circumstances of each individual case. He has given to tribes and nations, the civil right to choose their own form of government, and to change that form, whenever, in their opinion, there exist good and sufficient

reasons for so doing. But it should be kept in mind, that this right does not belong to the individual, nor to minorities, but to the body politic—to the great mass which constitute the people at large, and that it should never be exercised, unless there is a reasonable prospect of success, nor unless there is a prospect that to succeed will not cost more blood and treasure, than the change is worth. While we believe that aggravated oppression is a sufficient and perhaps the very best reason for revolutions, we also hold that there are other good reasons. It is left for the people themselves to decide when such reasons exist, and then they may lawfully revolutionize or change their form of government. Should the English nation almost unanimously conclude that to change their form of government to a republic, would vastly promote their happiness and prosperity, and should the change be opposed only by a few individuals in power, would they not have a right to effect such a change? Should the British Provinces on this continent conclude that it would be greatly to their advantage to separate from the Mother Country, and establish a government of their own, and that this result could be secured at comparatively a small cost, would they not have a right to attempt the change?

But, under a government where no reason exists for such a change, this doctrine of revolution has no practical bearing upon the citizen. In such circumstances, the government is to enact the laws and execute them. And the duty of the citizen is implicit subjection. The ordained rulers, are God's ministers to promote righteousness, and to seek the good of the people. If they abuse their high position, and use it for sinister purposes, they must answer

to Jehovah himself. They are supposed to have a judgment and conscience of their own, and are bound to enact such laws as are in conformity to the law of God, and will promote the best interests of the nation. They are not bound by the judgment and conscience of the subject. Such a doctrine carried out would subvert the very pillars of government. It would produce the worst kind of anarchy and misrule. It is, however, wisdom on the part of rulers in the enacting of laws, and as a matter of favor, to have regard to the consciences of their subjects, as far as is consistent with the great ends of government. It is upon this principle that the Quakers are exempted from bearing arms, and this duty is commuted to the payment of a certain sum of money. It is upon this principle that the individual who cannot conscientiously take the oath on the Bible, is allowed to take it by the uplifted hand. But this indulgence must not be carried too far. The Legislature of the state of New York, a few years since, enacted a law exempting the seventh day Baptists from legal process on Saturday. But they soon found it would not answer, and at the next session repealed it.

Here it may be inquired if the judgment and conscience of the government come in conflict with the judgment and conscience of the subject, what then is to be done? We answer—that if merely their judgments conflict upon matters which have nothing to do with the conscience, the subject is bound to submit in the direction of obedience. No matter how unwise he may consider a law, if it be not *wicked* he is bound to *obey* it. So in all cases where the subject is not clear in his own mind, that the thing required is wrong, we think the fact that the government com-

mands it, should decide him in favor of obedience. But where the conscience of the subject comes clearly in conflict with the enactments of government, neither should yield. Surely the government must not yield. Such a doctrine would be fraught with the most dreadful consequences. The government is bound to execute its laws, notwithstanding the conscience of the subject. Nor must the subject yield in the direction of obedience, but he is bound peaceably to submit to suffer the penalty.* This we believe to have been the doctrine and practice of Paul and the other Apostles: This we hold should be the doctrine and practice of all good citizens, and especially of the ministers of Christ.

The pulpit is a most powerful moral agency, and great care should be taken to give it a right direction. It requires a well balanced mind to maintain a *truly* conservative position. By which we mean, not a "*say nothing and do nothing*" position, but a position, which, under all the circumstances, will, to the greatest possible extent, *conserve the rights and privileges of all*. The people should be

* This *submitting to suffer the penalty* is not, as has been recently taught by an American Divine, *honoring the law*. He says, "If I cannot, with a good conscience, honor the law by obeying it, then will I honor it by suffering the penalty." A queer way this to honor the law. We can understand how government honors the law by *inflicting* the penalty, but we cannot understand how the culprit honors the law by *suffering* the penalty. Much less does that man honor the law, who suffers its penalty for *conscience' sake*, because he thinks the law so *base*, that he cannot obey it. Did Daniel, or "the three children," honor those laws which forbade the worship of the true God, and commanded the practice of idolatry, by refusing to obey them, and *submitting* to suffer the penalty? Did they not, by such a course, rather bear the most positive testimony against those laws? We are much mistaken, if, when "driven to the wall," the learned divine would not find it difficult to maintain his position.

taught submission to government. This duty cannot be too often or too powerfully inculcated; but they should also be taught that when human laws conflict with the Divine law, they are "to obey God rather than man." The true doctrine, under such circumstances, has been correctly stated to be, "*non-resistance to man, but obedience to God.*"* It is impossible to make good citizens by making bad christians. So, also, our rulers should be made to feel that they are God's ministers for good to those over whom they preside; that they have been ordained or appointed by him to be "a terror to evil doers and a praise to them that do well;" and that if they pervert the ends of justice, and oppress the subject, God holds them responsible, and will call them to an account. Things have come to a strange pass when ministers of the Gospel teach that governments, in matters belonging to them, are not amenable to God, and that the citizen owes *sole* allegiance to "the rulers of his people." When the pulpit speaks a language like this, it is no wonder that "the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against his Anointed, saying, 'Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us.'" How very different is the teaching of the Psalmist, who, with so much beauty and power, enjoins upon all rulers to "kiss the son (submit to his authority) lest he be angry, and they perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little."

* An exceedingly able and eloquent sermon, by our much esteemed friend and brother Rev. S. T. Spear, of Brooklyn. It came to our table while we were writing on the same subject. We are charmed with its manner and matter. It is "*multum in parvo*" on the subject of the citizen's duty to his God and country.

The first impression of the careful reader, while perusing the sermon now under review, will be that of amazement, that a christian pastor should teach such sentiments. But after an examination so close and critical as to see mirrored in its pages the mental attributes of its author, his amazement will give place to a conviction that it is the legitimate effect of a corresponding cause. It is evidently the production of a mind, in its action fervid, rapid, and oftentimes erratic—a mind sufficiently capacious and ambitious to grapple with subjects of the greatest importance, but not sufficiently careful in the examination of its premises, and, alas! too hasty in leaping to its conclusions—a mind exceedingly brilliant, and in many respects fascinating, but which frequently pours from its ample storehouse, in a crude, undigested, and unqualified manner, the first impressions of thoughts which others have taken a lifetime to mature.

Judging from the production before us, we would not be surprised if in six months time our author should publish another sermon to show that the Deity, since his relinquishment of all civil authority to human governments, is so delighted with the leisure he enjoys, that he has concluded to retire entirely from the affairs of the universe, and to relinquish his ecclesiastical rule in favor of the Presbyterian General Assembly. But we will not attempt to pierce the future. “Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.”

We do not intend, in this review, to enter upon the Bible argument on the subject of slavery. To do this, would swell its pages beyond its designed limit. Nor is there any necessity that we should; for our author has

not done it. He has contented himself with bold and unqualified assertions, and we are not bound to conclude that his assertions, without proof, are any more convincing than our own. Besides, we are too well acquainted with the laws of controversy, and the advantages of our present position, to care to change positions with him. We are unwilling, by entering a field which, in this sermon, he has neglected to explore, to throw him upon the defensive. Should he think proper to publish an argument to show that the Bible upholds slavery, we are prepared then to meet him. We have carefully examined the subject, and believe we can show that the Old Testament no more sustains slavery than it does polygamy, or the offensive slaughter of nations; and that Christ and his disciples have, neither by their precept nor example, given the *least sanction* to any system of *chattelizing* human beings.

We never have been a technical abolitionist, but we have no sympathy with the fugitive slave bill. Even admitting that "the compromises of the constitution" rendered necessary some law upon the subject, and that the national legislature are the body to enact it, there was no necessity for *such* a law. Upon the supposition that slavery is lawful, several of the provisions of this bill do great violence to some of the plainest principles of natural justice. We do not design to examine it "in extenso," but will refer, in illustration of the truth of our statement, to that unprecedented provision in section eighth, by which the commissioner is to receive for his services ten dollars if he finds against the individual claimed as a fugitive, and only five dollars if he finds in his favor. Is it worth any more to the commissioner—does it cost him any more

trouble and expense, to decide against the supposed fugitive than to decide for him? * Or does the government, in this "land of the free," hold that a decision in favor of slavery is worth just twice as much as one in favor of liberty? If not, how else can we view this extra allowance than as a bribe against freedom? What would we think of a law which should offer the judge, who is trying a fellow-citizen for murder, twenty dollars for his services, provided he acquits him, but *forty* dollars if he convicts him? Could the extra allowance of twenty dollars be otherwise viewed than as a bribe offered by the government to the judge against the prisoner, and in favor of his conviction? How long would the people endure such a law? Surely no longer than until it could be *constitutionally* repealed. But it may be said, the two cases differ. We admit it. In the one case, the probabilities are in favor of the prisoner's being *white*, in the other, they are in favor of his being *black*. In the one case life, and in the other liberty, is put in jeopardy—and we will leave it for the reader to decide if he would not prefer DEATH to SLAVERY.

Much, however, as we are opposed to the fugitive slave bill, we would by no means sanction forcible resistance from any quarter—not even from the slave. But with this remark, we would also say, that in our opinion, there is a wide distinction, between the natural right of the pursued fugitive to resist, and the right of the citizen to advise him so to do, and that there is likewise, a marked differ-

* Should it be said that it is more trouble for the commissioner to make out a certificate of delivery than to record a decision of discharge, we answer, that the difference, if there be any, must be trifling; and no one will pretend that it is worth as much as the whole previous investigation.

ence between, the slave's right to resist, and the expediency of such a course. Forcible resistance from any source, would be ill-advised and exceedingly unwise — from the citizen it would be as criminal as unwise. Under a government like ours, a government of such chartered privileges, the press and the ballot-box are far better and more efficient weapons of reform, than the bayonet and the sword. In our Republic, the will of the people is omnipotent. If they desire the repeal or modification of this law it will be done. If they do not desire it, seriously to talk, or even to think of resistance, would be absurd.

We believe the days of slavery are numbered. The "peculiar institution" has become decrepit with age. The deep furrows upon its brow, are the unmistakable marks of a sure decay. The time is not far distant when it will be sepulchered for ever. Causes are in operation which must produce this result. It is our duty, as citizens, calmly, judiciously, decidedly, and perseveringly to do what we lawfully can to aid the operation of these causes. But we should be careful, not to outrun the Providence of God, nor should we allow Providence to outrun us. We should bear in mind that its ponderous wheel is surely revolving upon its axis. God holds it in his hand, and directs its movements with unerring wisdom. In its revolution, it most certainly will crush every system of slavery. If we do not see it, our children may. We sincerely pray that He who is not merely the Bishop of bishops, but also "the King of kings, and the Lord of lords," will, in infinite mercy, hasten the period :— "And let all the people say, AMEN."

AN ADDRESS

TO THE

ANTI-SLAVERY, CHRISTIANS

OF THE UNITED STATES.

FRIENDS AND BRETHREN:—We address you in behalf of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. Approving of the principles avowed and the measures pursued by that association, we beg leave to submit to you the considerations which peculiarly entitle it at the present juncture to the active sympathy and effectual aid of the friends of the anti-slavery cause.

While the advocates of constitutional government in Europe are lamenting a wide-spread reaction in behalf of despotic authority, the friends of the inalienable rights of man behold with grief and mortification a similar reaction in our own Republic, in behalf of a despotism more inexorable, and more hostile to human progress and happiness, than any which afflicts the eastern continent. In both instances, the reaction is more apparent than real. Opinions in favor of human liberty remain the same, but the expression of them has to a greater or less degree been stifled by a sudden, mighty, and combined effort of capitalists and politicians, aided to a great extent by ecclesiastical influence, and in each case accompanied with violated pledges and revolting perfidy.

In our own community, the cause of Christian morals has been deeply wounded, and a new impulse given to infidelity, by the various modes adopted by merchants, politicians, and divines to conciliate the slaveholding interest. Doctrines have been advanced on high authority respecting the supremacy of human laws, which, if true, convict the "noble army of martyrs," including the blessed apostles themselves, of being but felons and traitors. Public men, and even public meetings, have professed in unqualified terms their ignorance of a higher law than the Federal Constitution. Rich men among us have given of their abundance to reduce to slavery the

fugitive from bondage; and lawyers, heretofore regarded as reputable, have not shrunk from taking reward against the innocent, and prostituting a noble profession to the service of the slave-catcher. The sympathy heretofore felt for the victim of oppression who had escaped from his prison-house, and the repugnance manifested to aid in his arrest, have been denounced as "prejudices to be conquered;" and lips which once uttered noble words in behalf of human rights, have been busily employed in proclaiming to republicans the duty of catching slaves. Nay, some professed ambassadors of the merciful Jesus have announced from their pulpits that He has sanctioned the conversion into articles of merchandise of beings charged with no crime, made a little lower than the angels, and redeemed by his own blood! A law has been passed for the recovery of fugitive slaves, which, for its cool violation of all the received and acknowledged principles of judicial justice, for its outrages on humanity, and for its arbitrary requirement of every citizen to assist in a slave-hunt when commanded by an official menial, is unexampled in the legislation of any Christian country. Yet an active agency in the execution of this most detestable law has been made, even by professed ministers of the gospel, a test of Christian obedience.

The success which has thus far attended the combined effort to which we have referred, has been in a great measure owing to the fancied security of the North and the simulated violence of the South.

The war against Mexico was waged for the acquisition of slave territory, and great was the fear felt by the North that human bondage would be extended to the shores of the Pacific. No less than fourteen States protested, through their Legislatures, against any enlargement of the area of slavery. The voice of Daniel Webster was raised to warn his countrymen of the impending calamity, and to approve and enforce the great principles announced by the Free Soil Convention at Buffalo. The innate love of liberty was awakened throughout the North, and its representatives in Congress bowed to the will of their constituents; and all the devices of the slaveholders to procure territorial governments for the conquered territories, allowing the slavery of a portion of the inhabitants, were defeated. Soon, the Wilmot proviso, applied, with the assistance of Daniel Webster, to Oregon, secured that important territory to freedom. This was followed by the joyful intelligence that New-Mexico and California had both adopted State Constitutions prohibiting slavery. A shout of victory ascended from the North, and the greatness of the triumph was supposed to be attested by the wailings of desperation uttered by the slaveholders. It was at this moment of fancied security that the capitalists and politicians contrived a panic about the Union, and traders in Southern votes and merchandise devised the patriotic work of saving the Union, by surrendering the territories of New-Mexico and Utah to the slaveholders, and making slave-hunting a national duty, under regulations of extraordinary cruelty. The work was hastened on by the most astounding treachery, supported by the audacious assumption that the law of physical geography and Asiatic scenery rendered

it physically impossible that any portion of the vast region conquered from Mexico could ever be trodden by slaves.

A dissolution of the Union could have no other effect on the slaveholding interest than to break down those bulwarks which the Federal Government, from its beginning, has been busy in raising around it, and to rouse all beyond the slave territory into active hostility. But although the Union was in little danger, the work of saving it was no less profitable than patriotic, as it tended to prevent the political and commercial non-intercourse threatened by the South; and the proceedings of Union-saving committees were found a convenient mode of advertising for the trade and the votes of the slaveholders. In this manner an influence was exerted which, aided by the supposed security of the North, led to the so-called Compromise, in which the fruits of the recent victory were all thrown away, with the single exception of the anti-slavery Constitution of California. Something was indeed gained to the *character* of the national capital, by prohibiting the importation of slaves for sale, but nothing to the cause of humanity, since the traffic was only transferred from Washington to Alexandria. In return for the Californian Constitution, which Congress could not have prevented and did not dare to annul, we have had the prodigious enlargement of the slave State of Texas, the abandonment of New-Mexico and Utah to slavery, and the enactment of the Fugitive Bill, as drafted by the slaveholders themselves, forced through the House of Representatives without discussion, and so intensely odious and wicked, that not even personal interest nor party discipline could induce one half of the members of the Lower House to incur the infamy of giving it their votes.

The political parties, having thus conciliated the slaveholders, entered upon a new race between themselves for power and office, and mutually agreed to prevent, as far as possible, all interference in the race by the avowed friends of human rights. The anti-slavery agitation was to be suppressed at all hazards; and every man who expressed sympathy for the oppressed, or indignation against slave-hunts, was to be driven from either party. By virtue of this compact, similar in its spirit to that which in Europe is smothering every aspiration for freedom, all who protest against the oppression of millions of native-born Americans are to be deemed disturbers of the public peace, while the powers of slaveholders, like those of kings, are to be regarded as held by the grace of God, and too sacred to be discussed or questioned.

It is under these circumstances, painful, mortifying, and unexpected, that we address ourselves to the Anti-Slavery Christians of the United States. The whole question of the duty of opposition to slavery rests on the sinfulness of reducing innocent men and women, and their children after them, to articles of merchandise. If human beings may be held as chattels, they are, of course, legitimate subjects of traffic, and the African, no less than the American slave-trade, is a commendable and a Christian commerce. The lawfulness of slavery in no degree depends on the complexion of its victims, since the slavery alleged to be recognized in the Scriptures was

unquestionably that of Asiatics and Europeans. None of our clerical champions of the institution ever venture to dwell on its accordance with the attributes of the Deity, or the precepts of the gospel. On what ground, then, is the moral vindication of American slavery rested? On the alleged fact that God permitted the Jews to hold certain heathen as slaves, and that, consequently, it cannot be morally wrong in Americans to hold their own countrymen, and even their fellow-Christians, and often their own children, brothers and sisters, as slaves. Without admitting the premises, we utterly deny the conclusion drawn from them. The Creator and Judge of all men, infinite in wisdom, goodness, justice, and power, selects his own modes of maintaining his moral government, and of inflicting deserved punishment; and none may say unto him, "What doest thou?" To him belongeth vengeance, and none may execute it in his name, except by his appointment. He saw fit to destroy by water a guilty world; but will it be inferred from this act of divine sovereignty that saints have a moral right to drown sinners? For their extreme wickedness, the seven nations of Palestine were doomed to extermination, and the Jews were ordered to take possession of their land, and to put all the inhabitants, men, women, and children, to the sword; to make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them. Does this commission to the Jews confer upon us similar rights in other lands? The nations adjoining Palestine were idolatrous and otherwise excessively depraved; and we are assured by pro-slavery divines that God, by an *express revelation*, gave the Jews the privilege of buying and holding their inhabitants as slaves; and hence we are taught that, without any similar revelation to ourselves, we are authorized to keep our own brethren in bonds, and to reduce them to the condition of beasts of burden, in defiance of the express commands of God to do justice and to love mercy, and to do to others as we would they should do unto us. We utterly deny the authorized existence of hereditary chattel slavery in the Jewish commonwealth, such slavery being absolutely forbidden by the universal emancipation proclaimed on each returning Jubilee. But so far as relates to the lawfulness of *American* slavery, it is wholly immaterial whether the Jews held slaves or not, since it is admitted by all that if they did, they acted by virtue of a special and express permission from God, while it is equally admitted that no such permission has been given to us. If American slavery be sanctioned by the religion of Jesus Christ, then, indeed, is that religion an inexplicable riddle, both tolerating and forbidding every species of cruelty, injustice, and oppression.

Friends and brethren, we believe before God that American slavery is hateful in his sight, and utterly irreconcilable with the holy and merciful precepts of the gospel of his Son. Hence, we believe it morally wrong to render any voluntary aid in upholding an iniquitous system, or in reducing a fellow-man to bondage.

We are continually told that the Federal Government has nothing to do with slavery, and yet from a very early period its powers have been exerted to protect, to extend, and to perpetuate the institution. It is the object of

the A. and F. A. S. Society to effect, as far as possible, an entire divorce of the Federal Government from the subject of slavery. In relation to the constitutional powers of the Federal Government, we indulge in no opinions more ultra than such as have been avowed by Daniel Webster himself. With him we hold that Congress is fully authorized to abolish and to forbid slavery in its own territories, to suppress the commerce in slaves between the States, and to refuse admission into the Union of new slave States. We also cordially concur in his "judgment," expressed in his speech in the Senate, on the 7th March, 1850, that the Constitution does not confer on Congress the right to legislate respecting fugitive slaves. In accordance with these views, the A. and F. A. S. Society aims at delivering the General Government from all entangling alliance with slavery, and they desire to effect this much-desired deliverance by inducing the people to select for their representatives in Congress such men only as will resolutely refuse to legislate in behalf of slavery.

But as Anti-Slavery Christians, our duties in regard to this horrible and sinful system extend beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and reach even to the slaveholders themselves. True Christianity is an aggressive religion. "Go ye into all the world," was the command of its divine founder. Can it be our duty to send missionaries into China and Hindostan, to rebuke the sins of their inhabitants, and to prostrate in the dust their altars and their gods, and yet to observe the silence of the grave in regard to a sin which, in our own country, reduces millions to ignorance, degradation, and wretchedness, and, by denying them the lamp of life, keeps them in virtual heathenism? Convinced that slavery is a sin, we not only have the right, but are bound by the obligations of Christianity, to oppose it, and to use all lawful means for its abolition, whether in our own or other countries. If slavery be not sinful, then we know not what degree of cruelty and injustice amounts to a violation of the law of God.

A combination of circumstances has led many of our clergy at the North, and nearly all at the South, to regard slavery, with all its inseparable abominations, as an exception from the Christian code. We must love all men as ourselves, with the exception of such as are black. With the same exception, we must do good unto all men, and exercise justice and mercy to all. We must give Bibles to men of all lands and all races, except to about three millions of our countrymen. The laws must protect the marriage tie, except in the case of these same millions. Supplications must be made for all men, except those among us who are of all men the most miserable. In short, as Christians, we must rebuke every sin except that giant sin of our nation which involves the perpetration of almost every other. But it is affirmed, by way of apology, that we at the North are free from this sin, and have therefore no concern with it. Were the assertion true, the apology would be equally valid for not attempting to overthrow the idolatry of the Hindoos, or the delusions of the false prophet, and for recalling all our missionaries to the heathen. But unfortunately the assertion is utterly destitute of truth. Probably not a sermon is preached in our large city churches

which is not listened to by slaveholders; probably not a congregation is assembled in the free States which does not include persons directly or indirectly interested in slavery. How many of our sons are constantly removing to the South, and becoming slaveholders! What numbers of our daughters are mistresses on slave plantations! How many Northern clergymen now descant from Southern pulpits on the divine rights of slaveholders! And shall we be told that Northern Christians have no cause to raise their voices against a sin which is daily corrupting their sons, their daughters, their politicians, and their clergy? Alas! there is a mighty conspiracy, prompted by selfish considerations, to suppress all discussion of this sin, all exhibition of its withering influence on human virtue and happiness. We have great national societies for disseminating Christian truth; but no reader of their tracts and Sunday-school books learns from their pages that it is sinful to rob black men of all their rights; to compel them to labor without wages; to deny them the Holy Scriptures; and to send fathers, mothers, and children to market, like cattle and bales of cotton. All other sins are in these publications faithfully and freely rebuked; but every allusion to this great and all-pervading sin of our nation is carefully excluded. Occasionally, a tract or religious biography from the other side of the water is deemed worthy of republication; but it is first submitted to a process significantly termed "cottonizing," and which consists in carefully expunging every expression condemnatory of human bondage. The A. and F. A. S. Society, utterly repudiating such a time-serving view of Christian duty, aims at convincing the hearts and understandings of all, both at the North and at the South, of the sinfulness of American slavery.

It must, however, be understood, that this Society directs its labors to the abolition of CASTE as well as of slavery. We have among ourselves a population, each individual of which is a swift witness of our cruelty and unchristian conduct. While protesting against the injustice and oppression practised by our Southern brethren, let us not forget the deep guilt of our Northern community in their treatment of the free people of color. No casuistry can reconcile the scorn and contumely poured upon these people with the precepts of the gospel of Christ; of that gospel which makes love for each other the badge of the Redeemer's disciples. It is unnecessary to dwell on the privations and disabilities to which our colored citizens are subjected. When the professed ministers of Christ refuse to sit in the councils of the church with their reverend brethren not colored like themselves, and when colored candidates for the ministry are excluded from theological seminaries solely on account of the tincture of their skin, it is not surprising that others should be as regardless of the temporal, as certain of the clergy are of the spiritual welfare of men to whom God has been pleased to give a dark complexion. When the pious colored youth is denied the usual facilities for qualifying him to minister to the diseases of the souls of his people, who shall rigidly condemn the professors of the healing art for denying similar facilities for ministering to the diseases of the body, by excluding colored students from their lecture-rooms? Surely, the ruffians

who insult and abuse the colored man, and the demagogues who, availing themselves of a popular prejudice, deny him equality before the law, have high examples to extenuate, if not to justify their pride and cruelty. In striving to secure to our colored people the rights freely accorded to all others, and thus giving them the means of maintaining themselves by honest industry, of developing and improving their talents, and of studying the things which belong to their peace, the Society is pursuing an object in perfect accordance with Christian benevolence, and one that must commend itself to every unprejudiced mind.

In our opposition to slavery and caste, we desire to use no instruments of unsanctified temper; nor have we any wish to conceal those we do use. Believing it sinful to compel an innocent man to serve as a slave, we must refuse to be partakers of other men's sins; and hence, under no circumstances can we aid in catching or securing fugitive slaves, whatever may be the penalties of our disobedience to a sinful act of Congress. It will be the endeavor of the A. and F. A. S. Society to dissuade all from joining in slave-hunts, as a palpable violation of Christian duty. Setting aside the moral turpitude of slavery, the Fugitive Slave Act comprises a mass of iniquity in no degree required by the provisions of the Constitution. The Act points out the mode of seizing and surrendering, not slaves, but *persons owing service or labor*, and is therefore applicable to white apprentices, and to persons under contract to labor for a limited time. Apprentices have already been surrendered under it, and there is no reason why others, who are alleged to have hired themselves out for a month or a year, may not be. To illustrate the intense injustice of this Act, let us suppose a young man to leave his father's home, in Boston or New-York, for California. After the lapse of a year or two, he returns. While pursuing an honest calling, he is arrested in the street, on the charge of stealing—the stereotype charge in such cases, to prevent resistance—and hurried before a Commissioner. An affidavit made in California, and there certified by a judge, is read, setting forth that the prisoner is the apprentice of the deponent. Immediately, without being permitted to produce any testimony to rebut a document which the law declares *SHALL BE CONCLUSIVE*, he is put in irons, and sent on board a vessel departing for the Pacific, without being permitted to take leave of his parents, wife, or children. Do we revolt at the mere supposition of such barbarity? But does the barbarity and injustice depend on the complexion of the victim? That the Constitution requires the perpetration of such horrible outrages on justice and humanity, is denied even by Daniel Webster, the great champion of the law, since he proposed giving the accused the benefit of a trial by jury. We should be faithless to the cause not only of Christianity, but of civil liberty, did we not oppose an enactment so detestably atrocious; one which establishes a title to property in an intelligent, accountable, immortal being, on testimony which in no civilized country would support the claim to a dog.

The cruelty and heartlessness attending the execution of this law, the extraordinary zeal which our rich men and politicians manifest in its behalf,

the sanction given to it by popular divines, and the infidel sneers which many of our party presses have deemed it expedient to cast on the advocates of "a higher law" than an act of Congress, have unitedly exerted a most disastrous influence on the tone of public morals. One of the most striking instances of this influence is the vile attempt made in Pennsylvania, under the special countenance of the Federal Administration, to convert resistance to the execution of the Fugitive Act into the capital crime of high treason. A fugitive, who had been arrested at Boston, was liberated by some of his colored friends, who, finding the door of his room in the courthouse open, hustled the officer, and secured the escape of the intended victim. Not a weapon had been provided, not a wound was given; yet the rescue was boldly proclaimed by Mr. Webster, Secretary of State, to be an act of treason, a levying of war against the United States!

On the 11th September, 1851, a more serious affair occurred. An armed party, headed by a deputy-marshal, attempted to arrest some fugitive slaves in Pennsylvania. The fugitives, aided by some others, stood on their defense. The claimant, a Maryland slaveholder, was shot in the affray, and the fugitives escaped. Five days after, the Governor of Maryland was officially informed, from the "Department of State," that "the District Attorney was specially instructed to ascertain whether the facts would make out the crime of TREASON against the United States, and, if so, to take prompt measures to secure all concerned for trial for that OFFENSE." Faithfully and zealously were the orders from Washington obeyed. Incredible as it may seem, a grand jury was found with consciences sufficiently pliant to present no less than seventy-eight indictments against thirty-nine persons, alleged to have been concerned in the riot. All were indicted for TREASON, as well as for various crimes of inferior grade.

Let it be recollected that the Constitution, to prevent tyrannical prosecutions for constructive treason, declares: "Treason against the United States shall consist ONLY in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." It may well be supposed that the Government selected for the commencement of the prosecutions the strongest case of the thirty-nine. On the 25th November, Oastner Hanway, a white man of irreproachable character, was placed at the bar, charged, on the oaths of the grand jury, that on the 11th September, 1851, "HE DID WICKEDLY AND TRAITOROUSLY LEVY WAR AGAINST THE UNITED STATES." The only offense proved against him was, that he was near the scene of action, unarmed, and on horseback, and that, when ordered by the deputy-marshal to aid him in capturing the fugitives, like an honest man, he declined rendering the required assistance. The presiding judge charged the jury that "The Court feel bound to say, that they do not think the *transaction* with which the prisoner is charged with being connected, rises to the dignity of treason or of levying war;" and a verdict of not guilty was returned without hesitation. This verdict led the Government to abandon all the indictments for treason, among which was one against Samuel Williams, a colored man, for levying war against the United States, by *giving notice to the fugitives*

that a warrant had been issued for their arrest! But still an effort was made to punish him for this act of benevolence, and he was tried on an indictment for misdemeanor, under the Fugitive Act, for obstructing the arrest by his notice, and for which, if convicted, he was liable to a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, and imprisonment not exceeding six months. The trial by jury was again vindicated by a verdict of acquittal. All the prosecutions were then abandoned in despair; and, if the gallows and the prisons were denied their intended victims, the Government could at least beseech the slaveholders to accept the will for the deed, especially as it is said no less than seventy thousand dollars were expended on these prosecutions from the public treasury.

In connection with the Fugitive Act, we ask your attention to the renewed efforts to transport the free people of color to Africa. We freely acknowledge not only the right of these people to seek a more favorable home than this country affords, but also the right and duty of others to afford them, according to circumstances, the aid they may desire for this purpose. But the American Colonization Society proffers them *undesired aid*, and some colonizationists recommend their removal to Africa, as rendering slavery more secure and more profitable, and relieving the country of a population which they represent as a "nuisance." To induce them to accept the proffered aid, the oppressions they here suffer are excused and often justified, while attempts to render their condition here more tolerable, by promoting their intellectual improvement and enlarging the field of their industry, are often discountenanced. In short, the whole tendency of the Society is, by rendering their condition here intolerable, to extort their consent to go to Africa. We all know the extreme anxiety of the slaveholders to expel the free blacks from within their borders. Says a late South Carolina paper,* recommending the State "to ship her free negroes to another land:" "The very condition and the circumstances that surround the free negro are in *direct hostility and diametrically opposed to the institution of slavery.*" Mr. Webster, in his memorable speech of 7th March, 1850, adroitly recommended himself to his new patrons by declaring that EIGHTY MILLIONS had been received from the sale of lands ceded by Virginia; and that, "if Virginia and the South see fit to adopt any proposition to RELIEVE themselves from the free people of color among them, they have my free consent that the Government shall pay them *any* sum of money out of the proceeds which may be adequate to the purpose." And again: "If any gentleman from the SOUTH shall propose a scheme of colonization to be carried on by this Government upon a large scale, for the transportation of her colored people to any colony or *any place in the world*, I should be quite disposed to incur almost any degree of expense to accomplish the object." Of course, the Secretary of State is willing to tax the whole republic to any amount not exceeding eighty millions, not to benefit the free people of color, not to civilize and Christianize Africa, but to banish to any part of the world hun-

* *Greenfield Mountaineer.*

dreds of thousands of his own countrymen, solely and avowedly to *relieve* the slaveholders, and give additional security and permanence to the system of human bondage; and this gentleman is now the public champion of the American Colonization Society.

We have in our country a population, free and bond, of between three and four millions, who, merely on account of their complexion, are treated with an almost total disregard of that justice and humanity enjoined by the religion we profess. The A. and F. A. S. Society are laboring to secure to them that Christian treatment to which the gospel of Christ entitles them. In this work of mercy, they invoke, and have a right to invoke, the countenance and aid of the Church. We are not unconscious that the Church has, in past ages, been frequently faithless to her high mission of cultivating peace and good-will among men; and he is but little acquainted with passing events who is ignorant that the American Church is at this moment one of the strongest buttresses of American caste and slavery. Would we, then, if we could, destroy the Church? God forbid. If the world is so full of sin and wretchedness notwithstanding the Church, what would it be without a Church? The answer may be found in the cruelties and abominations of paganism. But the ministers of Christ are men of like passions with others, and liable, like others, to be swayed by popular opinion and motives of self-interest. It is possible many of the clergy have not reflected that, in supporting and vindicating slavery, they are lending their countenance to an institution which outrages every moral precept they inculcate from the pulpit. What answer will the Northern clerical slave-catcher, or the Southern reverend slave-breeder and slave-trader, return to the inspired question, "He that loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen?" Surely it is worthy of remembrance that, at the day of final account, the Judge will consider as done to himself both the kindness and the cruelty shown to the least of his brethren.

We are constantly reminded that the Church is the great instrument of moral reform. Most gratefully do we allow that the precepts of the gospel are sufficient for all the moral necessities of man. "Do to others as you would they should do unto you," is a law which, if obeyed, would of itself banish slavery and oppression from the face of the earth. But unhappily the Church, or at least a portion of her ministers, have not always applied the precepts of the gospel to existing and popular sins. It is certainly no exaggerated statement, that not one sermon in a thousand delivered at the North contains the slightest allusion to the duties of Christians towards the colored population; while at the South multitudes of the clergy are as deeply involved in the iniquities of slavery as their hearers. It is no libel on the great body of our Northern clergy to say that, in regard to the wrongs of the colored people, instead of performing the part of the good Samaritan, their highest merit consists in following the example of the priest and Levite, and passing by on the other side, without inflicting new injuries on their wounded brother. But we rejoice to know that there are

ministers of Christ among us, and not a few, to whom these remarks are wholly inapplicable; men who pray and preach and labor against slavery and caste, and thus adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour. We rejoice also to know that such ministers are appreciated and honored by Christians abroad of every name. The clergy of England, Scotland, and Ireland decline admitting into their pulpits clergymen from this country holding what they deem heretical doctrines; but can they exclude any for a fouler heresy than that which abrogates all the Christian precepts of justice and mercy in their application to colored men? We trust our friends in Great Britain will not weaken our hands, and strengthen the pro-slavery influence of our churches, by overlooking, in their reception of American clergymen, the course they have pursued at home on the subject of slavery. They may be perfectly assured that the American clergyman who, abroad, is too dignified to be questioned as to his opinions on human bondage, is at home too patriotic to offer any vigorous opposition to the "peculiar institution" of his country.

We have thus frankly stated the objects of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, and confidently ask if they are not objects worthy to be pursued by rational, accountable, Christian men? Nay, we go farther, and ask, has not a Society pursuing such objects valid claims on the countenance and generous aid of every philanthropist and every Christian in our country?

Hostility to slavery has frequently been associated with various objects of political and moral reform. It is natural it should be so, since the same love for our neighbor which revolts at his oppression, seeks to advance his general welfare. But experience has fully proved that associated action cannot be efficiently maintained in behalf of various plans, respecting which the individuals associated entertain diverse opinions. Hence the A. and F. A. S. Society, without passing any judgment on other proposed reforms, confine their efforts in their associated capacity to the abolition of caste and slavery, leaving to their members individually the full and entire liberty of advocating and promoting, in such way as they may think proper, any other reforms, moral or political. We believe every man is bound to exercise the elective franchise in the fear of God; but while we shall ever rejoice in the election of virtuous rulers who will do justice and love mercy, it is not the province of the Society to recommend particular individuals for the suffrages of their fellow-citizens.

It is consoling to us to know that, in the sentiments we have expressed, we enjoy the sympathy of almost all without the limits of our own country who bear the Christian name. A vast multitude on our own soil hold the same sentiments, and, did they act with one heart and one voice, would soon triumph over the prejudice which supports caste, would array the Church on the side of mercy, and rescue the Federal Government from its unholy and unconstitutional alliance with slavery. But unfortunately the sympathies of this multitude, not being concentrated in action and counsel, are in no small degree powerless for good. The anti-slavery host has been

divided, and of course enfeebled, by conflicting opinions on topics not immediately affecting the colored man. For the sake of the slave, for the prosperity of the country, for the good of the Church herself, we earnestly desire the union of all abolitionists, and their harmonious action in behalf of their colored brethren. We ask all who approve the opinions we have expressed, to give vitality and energy to those opinions, by aiding the A. and F. A. S. Society in disseminating and enforcing them.

Public opinion is in this country the controller of legislation. Hence, at one period a traffic in African savages was encouraged by law, as an enlightened and legitimate commerce. At a later period, all but two States were desirous to abandon it, and, as a compromise, Congress was restricted from abolishing it until after twenty years. At a still later period, a commerce which had been guaranteed by the Federal Constitution was, by an act of Congress, denounced as PIRACY. Public opinion now, acting through the legislature, holds him a felon who brings to our shores for sale a native African, while we have just seen a citizen tried for his life because he declined to assist a slave-catcher in reducing to slavery a native American. To buy and sell Africans is wicked, base, and detestable; to buy and sell colored Americans is in perfect accordance with the most exalted position in both State and Church. In the city of New-York, we have seen "men of great stakes," merchant-princes, and others, lavishing courtesies on the most reckless and violent champions of slavery when they honored them with their presence; and we have seen these same gentlemen giving aid and comfort to the slave-catcher, without losing their place in polite society.

Most certainly public opinion on these subjects is unsound, and ought to be reformed. Very many of our clergy and their hearers need to be reminded that the commands of God have no reference to the color of a man's skin, but that all are equally entitled to receive, and are equally bound to render, the justice and benevolence enjoined by HIM who is the common Father of us all. Christians generally are to be warned not to be partakers of other men's sins towards the colored race. The cruelty of State and Federal legislation is to be exposed; the influence of the Colonization scheme in exasperating the prejudice against our colored brethren is to be demonstrated, and the public is to be fully instructed in the moral, social, and political evils resulting from slavery and caste.

But how are these great ends to be accomplished? Individual effort can do but little. In the present age, the press is the great lever by which the world is moved, but it can be employed to a great extent only through the united pecuniary contributions of many. The influence of a private Abolitionist can rarely reach beyond a contracted neighborhood; but as a member of the A. and F. A. S. Society, and a donor to its funds, he may address thousands. The *National Era* was established at Washington with funds supplied by the Society, and since repaid; and it now weekly addresses anti-slavery truth to seventeen thousand subscribers. The Society greatly needs a periodical of its own, but its present funds are insufficient for the

establishment of one. Treatises on various branches of this great subject are constantly offered to the Society, but it lacks the means of giving them to the public through the press. Intelligent, well-informed lecturers are wanted to awaken public attention, to collect popular assemblies, and to enlist the sympathies of those whose avocations deny them the opportunity of reading anti-slavery publications. Agents are desired to aid in the formation of auxiliary societies. Editors and authors are to be enlisted in the cause; and frequently, information and statistics, to be collected at much expense of time and labor, are needed for the use of members of Congress and other public men. The instrumentalities for influencing public opinion and correcting prejudices and erroneous statements are manifold, but they can be wielded only by associated funds and labors.

A crisis has arrived in which the friends of the anti-slavery cause should reorganize and act together. Unless they do this, their efforts to circumscribe the area of slavery, to break the fetters of the slave, and to rescue the free colored man from his present degradation, will be fruitless. Should the present mighty combination of capitalists, merchants, and politicians, aided by a number of popular divines enlisted in their service, succeed in suppressing all manifestations of sympathy for the slave, all discussion of the abominations of slavery, all compassion for the fugitive, the North will undoubtedly be prepared to sanction the designs now entertained for the erection of New-Mexico, Utah, and Southern California into slave States, together with the annexation of Cuba, Hayti, and the Sandwich Islands, all to be added to the domain of the slaveholder. Let us never forget that duties are ours, although events are not, and that, whatever may be the form in which it may please Divine Providence to punish our guilty land, he requires us not only to love mercy, but to do justice; a command we fail to obey, so long as we refuse to use lawful means to secure mercy and justice to others. Very many have no other opportunity of obeying this command, in regard to the colored race, than by their pecuniary contributions to the anti-slavery cause. The efforts of the A. and F. A. S. Society are now enfeebled by the exhausted state of their treasury.

Friends and brethren, we appeal to you in behalf of the Society. In the language of Scripture, we exhort you to show your faith by your works. So fully aware are our enemies of the importance of influencing public opinion by the Press, that a paper has been established at the capital of our Republic for the single and avowed purpose of vindicating and upholding human bondage. A large portion of the newspaper Press in our commercial cities is enlisted in the same unholy cause. Public rumor tells us, that a committee in the city of New-York, comprising many of its wealthiest citizens, raised a fund of one hundred thousand dollars; and knowing that opposition to slavery has its strongest fortress in the religious sentiment, this committee has spread broadcast through the land multitudes of copies of pro-slavery sermons. While the votaries of Mammon, and the aspirants to political power and emolument, are thus active and zealous in supporting and extending a horrible and degrading despotism, to further

their own selfish and ambitious views, will not the friends of righteousness, justice, and mercy be up and doing? We beseech you to reply by enrolling your names among the members of the A. and F. A. S. Society, and by speedy and liberal contributions to its treasury.

DAVID THURSTON,	Congregational Minister, Vassalboro, Me.
SAMUEL FESSENDEN,	Portland, Me.
TITUS HUTCHINSON,	Woodstock, Vt., Ex-Chief Justice.
LAURENCE BRAINAED,	St. Albans, Vt.
CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS,	Quincy, Mass.
SAMUEL OSGOOD, D.D.,	Pastor of the First Cong. Church, Springfield, Mass.
WILLIAM C. CHAPIN,	Fall River, Mass.
J. G. FORMAN,	Unitarian Cong. Minister, Nantucket, Mass.
J. C. WEBSTER,	Pastor of Congl. Church, Hopkinton, Mass.
J. P. WILLISTON,	Northampton, Mass.
JOHN PIERPONT,	Unitarian Congregational Minister, Medford, Mass.
BANCROFT FOWLER,	Congregational Minister, Stockbridge, Mass.
ISAAC BASSETT,	Stockbridge, Mass.
WILLIAM WHITNEY,	Stockbridge, Mass.
WILLIAM W. PATTON,	Pastor of Fourth Cong' Church, Hartford, Conn.
WILLIAM JAY,	Bedford, N. Y.
W. W. EVERTS,	Pastor of the Baptist Church, Wheatland, N. Y.
S. S. JOCELYN,	Pastor of First Cong. Church of Williamsburg, N. Y.
JOHN CHANEY,	Minister of the Free Will Baptist Denomination.
D. W. GRAHAM,	Pastor of the Free Will Baptist Church, Sullivan street, N. Y. City,
J. WARNER,	Williamsburg, N. Y.
LINDLEY MURRAY MOORE,	Rochester, N. Y.
HARMON KINGSBURY,	Staten Island, N. Y.
J. A. PAINE, M.D.,	Albany, N. Y.
WILLIAM E. WHITING,	New-York City.
JOHN RANKIN,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
LEWIS TAPPAN,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
ARTHUR TAPPAN,	Belleville, N. J.
GEORGE WHIPPLE,	Belleville, N. J.
C. D. CLEVELAND,	Philadelphia.
SAMUEL RHODES,	Blockley, near Philadelphia, Pa.
CHARLES AVERY,	Minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, Alleghany City, Pa.
CHARLES B. BOYNTON,	Pastor of Pine st. Cong. Church, Cincinnati, Ohio.
JOHN RANKIN,	Pastor of Second Presbyterian Church, Ripley, O.
T. B. HUDSON,	Professor of Languages, Oberlin College, Ohio.
JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS,	Member of Congress from Ohio.
FLAVEL BASCOM,	Pastor Congl. Church, Galesburg, Ill.
JONATHAN BLANCHARD,	President of Knox College, Ill.
CHARLES DURKEE,	Member of Congress from Wisconsin.
J. BIGELOW,	Washington City.
JOHN G. FEE,	Pastor Independent Congregational Church, Cabin Creek, Lewis Co., Ky.
ELLIS CLIZBE,	Amsterdam, N. Y.

New-York, May, 1852.

CONSTITUTION

OF THE

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

P R E A M B L E.

WHEREAS the Declaration of American Independence asserts that it is a self-evident truth, "that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and whereas this political axiom is based upon the Holy Scriptures, which declare that God "bath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth," and which require all mankind to love their neighbors as themselves; and whereas nearly three millions of the people of this country are held in slavery by their fellow-countrymen; and whereas the practice of buying and selling human beings prevails to an alarming extent; and whereas every man, irrespective of color, is entitled to equality of rights on the soil of his birth and residence; and whereas the prejudice against color, which exists in this country, is sinful in the sight of God, and should be immediately repented of; and whereas no scheme of expatriation should be countenanced by any friend of man or God; and whereas we owe it to the oppressed, to oppressors, to our country, to the world, and to God, to do all that is right, and lawfully in our power, to bring about the extinction of slavery and the slave-trade; we do hereby agree, with a prayerful reliance on the Divine aid, to form ourselves into a Society, to be governed by the following CONSTITUTION:—

ARTICLE I.

The name of this Association shall be the AMERICAN AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

ARTICLE II.

The objects of this Society shall be the entire extinction of slavery and the slave-trade; and the equal security, protection, and improvement of the people of color.

ARTICLE III.

The following are the fundamental principles of this Society:—That slaveholding and slavetrading are heinous sins in the sight of God, and violations of the rights of man, and ought to be immediately abandoned; that so long as slavery exists, there is no reasonable prospect of the annihilation of the slave-trade, and of extinguishing the sale and barter of human beings; that the extinction of slavery and the slave-trade is to be attained by moral, religious, and pacific means; that while the Society exacts no specific pledges as a condition of membership, it will urge on all the duty of exercising the political franchise against the election of any slaveholder, and in behalf of the enslaved; that the legislative action of government should be invoked to abolish slavery and the slave-trade, for the enfranchisement of free people of color, and to restrain the lawless from invading the rights of others; and that no measures be resorted to by this Society, in the prosecution of these objects, but such as are in entire accordance with these principles.

ARTICLE IV.

The Society will employ the following means, among others, to effect the abolition of slavery and the slave-trade:

1. They will circulate accurate information on the enormities of slavery and the slave-trade; furnish evidence to the inhabitants of the slaveholding States, not only of the practicability and safety, but of the pecuniary advantage of free over slave labor; diffuse authentic intelligence respecting the results of emancipation in the West Indies and elsewhere; open a correspondence with Abolitionists throughout the world, and encourage them in the prosecution of their objects, by all methods consistent with the principles of this Society.

2. They will recommend the use of free-grown produce, as far as practicable, in preference to slave-grown.

3. They will urge upon all, and especially upon the ministry and Church of Christ,

the duty of embracing every suitable opportunity for exhibiting to slaveholders and slavetraders, and their apologists, an abhorrence of the system which they uphold, and its utter incompatibility with the spirit of the Christian religion.

ARTICLE V.

Any person who consents to the principles and objects of this Society, and contributes annually to its funds, shall be a member of this Society; and the payment of thirty dollars, at any one time, shall constitute an individual a member for life.

ARTICLE VI.

The Society shall annually elect a President, two Vice Presidents, Secretaries, and a Treasurer; and in case of a vacancy occurring from any cause, the Executive Committee shall have the power to fill such vacancy.

ARTICLE VII.

The Society shall annually elect an Executive Committee, of whom nine members, at least, shall reside in the city of New-York, and vicinity; and five, regularly convened, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

This Committee shall have power to elect their own officers; to fill all vacancies which may occur in their number; to call an annual meeting of the Society at New-York, or elsewhere, at which a report of their doings shall be made; to transact all the business of the Society in the intervals of the annual meetings; to convene special meetings of the Society, when necessary; and to collect funds through their auxiliaries, or otherwise, according to their discretion.

ARTICLE VIII.

The meetings of this Society, for the transaction of business, shall consist of its officers, and such other men as may be sent as delegates. Each State or Territory Society, auxiliary to this, shall be entitled to send two delegates; and every local Association, (consisting of not less than fifty members,) whether auxiliary to the State or Territory Societies, or to this Society, shall be entitled to one delegate for every fifty members.

ARTICLE IX.

This Society shall invite and encourage the formation of Women's Auxiliary Anti-Slavery Societies, in furtherance of its objects, which Societies may be represented according to Article VIII.

ARTICLE X.

This Constitution may be amended at any annual meeting of this Society, by a vote of two thirds of the delegates present, provided the amendments proposed have been submitted, in writing, to the Executive Committee three months previously.

OFFICERS.

President.—ARTHUR TAPPAN.

Vice Presidents.—F. JULIUS LE MOYNE and WILLIAM JAY.

Corresponding Secretary.—LEWIS TAPPAN.

Recording Secretary.—JAMES MCCUNE SMITH, M.D.

Treasurer.—WILLIAM E. WHITING.

Executive Committee.—Arthur Tappan, S. S. Jocelyn, William Jay, Lewis Tappan, William E. Whiting, Joshua Leavitt, S. E. Cornish, James Warner, Alexander Macdonald, Arnold Buffum, George Whipple, Thomas Ritter, J. W. C. Pennington, E. D. Culver, D. C. Lansing, Henry Belden, and A. N. Freeman.

D. Root.

MINORITY REPORT,

OF A
COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL ASSOCIATION
OF CONNECTICUT,

ON THE
SIN OF SLAVERY.

*Presented, June 1849, at the meeting of the Association, at
Salisbury; Conn.*

To the General Association of Connecticut:

The undersigned, having been appointed on a Committee which was to report at the meeting of the Association, in Salisbury, has met repeatedly with his colleagues, for the purpose of preparing a report which might combine the views and obtain the assent of the whole Committee; but while cordially agreeing with some of the opinions which the report of the majority contains, he was compelled to the conclusion that it did not take that position, which is now evidently demanded of the Church, and which was expected by those who appointed us. He therefore respectfully submits the following Report.

At the last meeting of the Association in Hartford, June, 1848, the following preamble and resolution were introduced:

"WHEREAS it is matter of common fame that large numbers of the members and ministers of the Presbyterian Churches are Slaveholders: and also that cruelties and wrongs are extensively inflicted on the Slave for which no discipline is inflicted,

"And whereas the General Association of Connecticut has long exchanged Christian civilities and delegates with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church [meeting annually] which friendly intercourse gives us the right and duty of expostulation in case of alleged gross departure from soundness in doctrine, or from justice and rectitude in conduct,

"Therefore resolved, that a Committee of three be appointed to prepare a letter of inquiry and expostulation as to the afore-said matters of grievance, and that our delegate to the next meeting of the General Assembly be instructed to carry such letter to them."

This Resolution was very fully discussed; and in its main features met with the approbation of one-half, at least, of the Association. The course recommended in it was delicate and respect-

ful—terminating in a friendly letter of inquiry. After protracted discussion, one gentleman proposed,—*not the rejection of the resolution*—but a simple postponement for a moment, that he might read a substitute. This proposal of so brief a postponement was met with a tie vote, and carried by the voice of the Moderator. The substitute was then read, and carried by a vote, almost unanimous: and is as follows:

“WHEREAS this Association is in the dark respecting the discipline exercised by certain ecclesiastical bodies in correspondence with us in regard to the sin of Slavery,

“Therefore resolved, that a Committee of three be appointed by this body to collect facts and make inquiries respecting this subject, and make report to the next General Association.

“And that Rev. Dr. Bacon, Rev. Messrs. Perkins and Atwater, be said Committee.”

It will be perceived that this document is much more decided and energetic in its terms and proposed action, than the one first proposed: that it speaks of Slavery as a sin; and makes it necessary to bring up the whole matter for consideration again—which the original resolutions did not. The undersigned therefore could not but receive these facts as indication of a deep and earnest feeling in the Association, that they had important duties to the slave and the slaveholder: duties which were to be met by kind, but firm Christian faithfulness.

It was gratifying also to learn that other ecclesiastical bodies in New England, at about the same time, had made arrangements similar to our own, for ascertaining and performing their duty towards those Churches which are connected with Slavery. All these simultaneous yet disconnected movements, are indications of a wide spread and rising public opinion, that the Churches of the Free States generally, as well as of Connecticut, should take a more decided and active position, antagonistic to Slavery.

The General Convention of Vermont, at their meeting, June 20, 1848, after assenting to a strong statement as to the nature and sin of slaveholding, resolved, “that this Convention appoint a Committee to consider thoroughly whether it is or is not the duty of this body to withhold fellowship from individual Churches and other ecclesiastical bodies on account of their practice or toleration of slaveholding: and particularly whether our present connection with the two General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, ought not to cease on account of their continued toleration of this gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature: and that such Committee make a written report of their opinions together with the reasons of them, to this Convention at its next annual meeting.”

The Convention of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts at their meeting in 1848, appointed a Committee to draw up "a solemn and earnest appeal to the community on this momentous subject"—[Slaveholding in the Churches.]

The Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland, last year addressed a letter of expostulation, to the General Assembly, on their connection with Slavery. Various ecclesiastical bodies in Scotland and Ireland and Canada, have done likewise.

Your Committee are happy therefore to find this additional evidence, that in the duty assigned to them by the Association, their course is one sanctioned by the best ecclesiastical authority and eminently in unison with Christian propriety and duty.

We are still more gratified that the General Assembly itself, regards our action with favor; for the Rev. gentleman, who represented the General Assembly [Old School] on the floor of the Association, candidly and publicly avowed, after the solemn and almost unanimous vote, by which this Committee was appointed,—that "*He regarded the late action of the Association as calculated to increase and perpetuate, not weaken the bonds of fraternal union.*" As the constituted organ of that body, he probably conveys to us their views; so that we are happy in having the approbation of the General Assembly in our present course of investigation. His statement will at once remove the fear which some have expressed — that our agitation of the matter is offensive to the South, and endangers our friendly relations with Southern Christians. He assured us, on the contrary that he was "gratified" with our action.

The resolution under which we act says nothing of the *atrocities* and *cruelties* sometimes alleged to exist in connexion with Slavery. Nor could the Association have designed that we should enter on that subject, for they did expressly *lay aside* a resolution which alluded to *such topics*, and adopted the present one as a substitute. We were enjoined to inquire concerning the "*Sin of Slavery*," and the discipline exercised therefor. In commissioning us however to collect facts and make inquiries, they well understood that we had no legal powers, and could not pursue the course of legislative Committees clothed with authority to procure evidence. Of course they could not have expected us to come with affidavits and judicial documents. But we were to use all those means of information which candid and intelligent Christian men could find, and were to lay the result before the Association.

The resolution does not specify the ecclesiastical bodies whose course was to be made the subject of inquiry. But the Committee could not long remain in doubt as to the direction in which they were to look. For of all the ecclesiastical bodies with which

we are in correspondence, there are only two which have Churches—or many churches—under their care in the slaveholding states. These are the two Presbyterian bodies, each styled, “General Assembly.” Under their jurisdiction are one thousand or more Churches within the states where Slavery prevails. Of course then, these must be “the certain ecclesiastical bodies” with which we are concerned in this report.

The *first* inquiry then which it was obviously the duty of the Committee to institute was this:—*Is slavery, or slaveholding, common among the members of the Churches alluded to?* On this point, we did not deem it necessary to go into any formal and elaborate investigation, because the facts are so well known,—being matters indeed of perfect and undeniable notoriety.

Rev. James Smylie, a Presbyterian clergyman of Mississippi, in a pamphlet written in defence of Slavery states that *three-fourths* of all Presbyterian Church members at the South, are slaveholders. This statement has been freely assented to by other gentlemen, equally well qualified to judge. Professed Christian people at the South conform to the usages of the country, in procuring, and holding slaves; and as matter of course their work is done by slaves. This fact is freely allowed on all sides, both by those who deny and those who assert the right and propriety of holding slaves.

But not only do individuals who are members of the Church hold slaves, but *Churches* and ecclesiastical bodies, in their official or Church capacity hold Slaves. For it appears that in the year 1845, eight slaves, were sold at public auction together with cattle and furniture in behalf of the “Directors of the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia.” It also appears, that some Churches at the South, are in the habit of raising the salaries of their pastors by owning Slaves, and jobbing or hiring them out annually to the highest bidder. A moments’ reflection will convince us, that for obvious reasons the condition of a Slave hired out to one who has no farther interest in him than for the year, must be much harder, than the hard condition of one living with his owner. It is therefore reported to the Association as a fact, that *Slaveholding prevails to an enormous extent among the Presbyterian Churches at the South.*

But the true state of the case is not submitted, with the bare statement of these facts. For to many minds these facts are supposed only to establish the position, that many members of Presbyterian Churches at the South, sustain a “mere relation” to the slaves:—while it is also maintained that the fact of sustaining a mere relation, which the law has established, implies no sin whatever—that if the *law* has established the relation of slave and

slaveholder — then the individual slaveholder is no more accountable for sustaining that relationship than the slave himself.

The Committee were entirely of one mind as to the truth of this position,—viz: that a *relation established solely by the law, implies no guilt* in one whom the law invests with that particular relation: *so long as it remains true*, that it is a “mere relation:” a mere act of the law, which implies and involves no individual act. But when the individual *acts* in that relation, and by virtue of that relation, and uses the power which that legal relation gives him—then he *ceases* to stand in a “mere relation:”—and the *individuals’ own act* is now concerned, which may be right or wrong according to circumstances. Thus did Southern law simply proclaim that every black man should be the slave of the white man who lived nearest to him, that law would institute a “mere relation,” for which the white neighbor is neither blameable nor accountable, unless he gave his assent to the law, and while he allows the law to remain a dead letter. But so soon as he attempts to *take advantage* of the law, compels the black man to work for him, uses the authority which the law gives him over his colored neighbor, and holds him liable to all the incidents of slavery:—then he cannot plead his innocence on the ground of a “mere relation.” There is in the case individual action in that relation—which individual action, like all other individual acts, is to be tried by certain tests of right and wrong.

The undersigned humbly submits, that this last case represents the state of the mass of slaveholding Church members. There are cases no doubt, in which slave property falls by inheritance to a minor. While that heir is a minor, it is strictly true, that he sustains a “mere relation:” a relation which he did not originate: which, in his case, is the mere creature of law; and which he has no power to terminate: and for which, of course, he is not accountable. But when he ceases to be a minor, and has legal power to act, and does *act* in any way towards those slaves *as slaves*, then the “mere relation” ceases: and whether his action be right or wrong he can no longer allege in justification that he sustains a “mere relation.” His conduct towards a certain class of his fellow beings is now to be investigated. But while there are these and other cases in which a “mere relation” exists, the fact is not true of the great mass of cases: and our inquiry now relates to men who *act* in the relation of slaveholders.

It is necessary to advert very distinctly to this point, and to recur to it again and again—because the design and meaning of those who plead for ecclesiastical action towards slaveholders, is evidently misunderstood:—they are supposed to affirm that which they never dreamed of; and positions are solemnly laid down and argued, as if against them, which they have never denied. The

sentiment stated in the following vote of the General Assembly [New School] has been for substance repeated many times, as if it was the point in debate between them and those who wished for decisive ecclesiastical action. They say, in 1846, and repeated, 1849,—“We cannot pronounce a judgment of general and promiscuous condemnation implying that destitution of Christian principles and feelings which should exclude from the table of the Lord, *ALL who stand in the legal relation* of masters and slaves, or justify us in withholding our ecclesiastical and Christian fellowship from them.”

So far as the undersigned is aware, the General Assembly has never been requested to take any such step; and certainly not by this Association. No one asserts that a “mere legal relation,” is the sin of any persons, except of those who instituted it. But it is affirmed that of the thousands of slaveholders in the Presbyterian Church, with but here and there an exception, they are “voluntary slaveholders”—they do not MERELY “stand in a legal relation” but USE THE POWER *given by that legal relation* to hold their fellow-men as slaves: depriving them of their most precious and sacred rights. *Such* slaveholders, we conceive should not receive “ecclesiastical and Christian fellowship.” But we are compelled to believe that the mass of slaveholding members and ministers of the Presbyterian Churches, *are* such slaveholders: and we see no effort made by those Churches, to rid themselves of *such* slaveholders:—on the contrary, their discipline is limited to cases of “cruel treatment,” so called, the true nature of which we shall have occasion to examine.

Slaveholding Church members at the South, *use the power*, which the law gives them: they use it in compelling their slaves to work for them without wages—they use it, to *retain* them as slaves—thereby exposing each human being so retained to the horrible danger of being sold as a mere chattel, at the death or bankruptcy of the master—they use it in preventing the slave father from educating his child as he would wish, and from training him to such a trade as he would prefer:—they use it by treating as a slave, every child born of his slaves. All this, to say no more, is true of every voluntary slaveholder whether in the Church or not. The case is not at all met therefore by the mere truism, that a man is not to blame, for a mere legal relation, or for the mere possession of a power which the law gives him.

Somewhat analogous to the position just alluded to, is another, which is often stated in debates as to the propriety of ecclesiastical action. It is this for substance,—“that if the slaveholder treats his slaves well, we are not authorized to inflict censure for the mere fact of his being a slaveholder.”

But it is necessary to ascertain what is meant by the phrase,

good treatment, in the language of a slaveholding community? It is to be feared the habit of regarding one class of human beings as slaves, as property—bought and sold as property—and in the language of the law “chattels personal to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever,” must almost necessarily modify the ideas of one so situated, as to what conduct in that relation is right. Thus, for instance, we regard a horse, as a horse; and man as sustaining to him, the relation of rightful owner. Now right conduct or good treatment in that particular relation, means, of course, that which is *good treatment towards a horse*. But it is perfectly evident that a course of treatment which would universally be esteemed just and kind towards a horse, would be cruel and brutal if rendered to a *man*. A modification somewhat analogous must take place in our interpretation of the assertions of the proper conduct and kind treatment, observed generally towards *slaves*. Habitually regarded as belonging to an inferior and degraded race, stripped by the law of all legal rights: almost entirely at the mercy of the owner: bought, sold, and exchange like any other property, asserted *good treatment* towards a slave, means *such* good treatment as is appropriate to a degraded chattel, not such treatment as a man can claim. This must be remembered, when public statements are made of good conduct and treatment to the slave.

Thus, for instance, *we* should consider it the height of injustice and atrocity, if a Church of five hundred members, some of them rich men, should, because the *law*, or a “mere relation” enabled them so to do, compel some twenty of their number to work out at hire, and should take the whole of their wages wherewith to pay the salary of the Pastor, leaving it a mere peradventure whether they should ever hear the Gospel which they thus support. *We* should consider this no less than outrage and robbery, if *men* were thus compelled to work, and *their* wages thus used, while all the rest of the Congregation paid little or nothing. But this is considered and styled *good treatment* towards the slave—provided, the slave is comfortably fed and clothed. And it is the testimony of one who well knows, “that what would be regarded at the north, as wrong, cruel and oppressive [towards men] is regarded, as mild, lenient and courteous treatment towards a slave.”

Further: *we* should consider it as bad conduct in the relation of laborer and employer, if the employer for any reason should *strike* a *man* whom he hired: it would not be endured for a moment; legal redress would be obtained, and Church discipline enforced. But the chastisement of *slaves* either with the hand or the whip, more or less “*moderately*,” for what the master deems an offence, is considered very proper conduct in that relation. *We* should consider it the last and extremest outrage upon a *man*,

if for any crime, and after due and impartial trial in court, with all the aid of legal advisers, he should be *sold* to Turkey or Algiers, or even to a cotton planter. But if a *slave* commits no higher crime than being fractious and lazy,—which means that he has enough of the spirit of a man to desire liberty and wages—it is considered *proper conduct* towards the *slave*, at the mere will of the master, without court, trial or jury, to sell *such an one* to the far South. It would be very criminal conduct towards a *man*, or the *child of a man*, to deny him the opportunity of learning the rudiments of education, including not only reading, but writing, arithmetic and geography. But even some “good masters” do not teach their *slaves* to read: and it is considered as proper conduct in the relation to prevent a *slave's child* from learning to write, to cypher, and understand geography. We consider it an atrocious act to deprive a *man* of liberty without crime and due process of law: yet thousands of Church members *retain slaves*: i. e., use the power which the law gives them, to deprive the *slaves* of liberty without crime alleged, and such conduct is proper in that relation. It would be one of the most cruel wrongs to prevent a *man* from educating his own child, and fitting him for the highest attainable intelligence and respectability in future life:—but in the relation of slaveholder it is considered proper and right for the master to take the *slave's child*, and train him up without reference to the wishes of the parent, in such ways and to such business as will make him profitable to the owner. Indeed the mere fact that a *man* is *held* as a slave, proves that he is not well treated as a *man*.

In these remarks we have cautiously abstained from alluding to what is called “cruel treatment”—such as insufficiency of food and clothing: torturing and murderous punishments, by the cat, the paddle, and the fire. We are entirely willing to believe that *such kinds* of outrages are not common among Church members at the South, and in case of attainable evidence, would be discountenanced and disciplined. That class of facts, the Association did not commission us to investigate. But it was our object to show that in the simple fact, that thousands of Presbyterian Church members at the South held Slaves, there was involved a great deal more than a “mere relation,” that if the slaveholder persists in continuing to hold slaves *as slaves*, there is necessarily involved in most cases, gross outrages on them *as men*: and that conduct which towards *men*, would be resented as unchristian and barbarous, is esteemed appropriate to the *slave*. We desired also to suggest a principle of interpretation by which the terms “good and kind treatment towards the slave” might be understood.

We are also to remember that all our evidence as to the “good treatment” of slaves is *interested testimony*. It is drawn princi-

pally from the *slaveholders themselves*: with some corroborative statements from the friends and associates of the slaveholders, identified with them in race, color, and prejudice. The testimony of the *slave* is not received. Among the twenty thousand slaves who have emigrated from the land of bondage within the last fifteen years, are many who are themselves members of churches, and who have served slaveholding Church members. They, or many of them, give very different testimony: they assert that they felt most keenly that the mere fact of being held as slaves was cruel treatment—and moreover declare, that gross personal cruelties are practised to a great extent by slaveholding Church members, unrebuked and unnoticed by ecclesiastical authorities. This testimony is usually set aside without ceremony, under the plea that it is interested testimony. But the undersigned humbly submit that the slave is as well qualified to judge as the slaveholder, whether his treatment is kind or cruel—that the slaveholder is under the strongest possible influence to give a favorable account of his own conduct: and that therefore if the testimony of the slave be set aside on the ground alluded to, then the slaveholder's testimony should also be rejected, for the same reason. Then we should simply be led to decide upon the question, divested of all extraneous matter, in what light are we to regard the Church member, who takes advantage of wicked laws to hold *men* as slaves, and use them *as slaves*, an act "which is utterly at variance with the law of God"—"which violates the most sacred rights of human nature."

Our *second* inquiry must of course be:—Is *discipline* ever inflicted for the sin of slavery?—The answer is plain, and known to every one. *Slaveholders, as such, are never disciplined nor questioned.* The propriety of this course, is usually argued on the ground repeatedly alluded to, that the Church should inflict no censure on the slaveholder for a "mere relation," but only for some overt acts of cruelty proved against him. It will be conceded on all sides, that the "mere relation" of slave owner, implies no guilt. One case of this kind has already been stated, that of a minor, in whom the law of inheritance vests property in slaves. There may be cases in which, for the purpose of *ransoming slaves*, and giving them freedom, it may be necessary to take a bill of sale, and thus be placed for a few days in a certain legal relation to the one so ransomed from bondage. In such cases, and in analogous ones, which need not be enumerated, there can be no blame, and of course, no call for discipline. But these cases are but exceptions, and rare exceptions. It will become necessary therefore to examine the general rule of discipline, applicable to the case of slaveholders who are, or propose to be, members of the Church. One general principle may thus be stated:

In case of connection and participation in any enormity, the prima facie evidence of guilt is strong, and Christian character is only to be imputed and Church privileges granted when there is positive evidence, in each individual case that such connection is unavoidable or justifiable. Let us apply this statement to slaveholding.

That Slavery, as a system, is a great enormity, only a few fanatics affect to doubt. The language on this subject, used by ecclesiastical bodies, and by eminent men, is very decisive and strong. Even the General Assembly declared, many years ago, before the influences of the present day from the South were pressing on them—that the enslaving of a human being, “is a violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature—and utterly at variance with the law of God.” The American Board speak of “the whole system as based on unrighteous principles, and violates the natural rights of man.” The great founder of Methodism, styled it “the sum of all villainies.”

If this language is correct, and it has been purposely selected from those who could not be suspected of ultraism, then any connexion or participation in the system, involves a grave responsibility. Whoever voluntarily connects himself with “a violation of the most precious rights of man,” whoever is found participating in a system “utterly at variance with the law of God,” “and based on unrighteous principles”—has clear *presumptive evidence* of great guilt upon him; and so far as *prima facie* evidence goes, is himself living in utter violation of the law of God, and practising the sum of all villainies. It is readily conceded that this clear and strong presumptive evidence may be cleared away: that individuals may bring full proof that their connexion with the system is unavoidable or justifiable: but this *is not to be taken for granted*. And when the presumptive and positive evidence is clear and strong, *the individual must be held to the proof*, that his participation in this system of abominations is involuntary or innocent.

These are the principles we apply when we speak of “discipline for the sin of slavery”. It is not maintained as some appear to suppose, that a “mere relation,” *ipso facto*, and without any farther inquiry should be the occasion of exclusion from Church fellowship. We desire no such thing. But the position taken is this: that at the South there is an institution, “utterly at variance with the law of God”—“founded in unrighteousness”—and “which violates the most sacred rights of man:” yet thousands remain in the Presbyterian Churches who are voluntarily and perseveringly partaking in all the acts, relations and advantages of this system, without the slightest inquiry being made into the nature

of that relation, without a question asked as to the reasons which might justify a Christian's connection with such a system of abominations; that they allow such an immense proportion of their members to continue unrebuked with such strong presumptive evidence of partaking in all the guilt of such a system, without calling on them in a single instance, to rebut this *prima facie* evidence, by any testimony that they are excusable or justifiable in holding slaves.

The undersigned thinks that men's judgment would be unanimous in any analogous case. Thus for instance the system of *piracy*, is "utterly at variance with the law of God"—"a violation of the most sacred rights of human nature." Now if any one should be captured in a pirate ship, and be found among the crew, doing the ordinary work and fighting of a pirate sailor; that would be considered *prima facie* and sufficient evidence that he *was* a pirate, and he would be condemned accordingly. Still there would be room for counter testimony. He might be able to prove that his presence on board that ship was involuntary,—that he had been forced on board and compelled there to work—and that his connection with the pirate ship was one which involved no guilt on his part. But before acquitting him, and much more, before receiving him to the Church, we should expect that the strong presumptive evidence in his case, should be fully met and refuted. Just so, when one partakes in the atrocious system of slavery, by buying or holding a slave, it is righteously demanded of him, before we accord to him Christian fellowship, that he prove his connection to be involuntary, or justifiable. There is unquestionably a distinction between "slavery as a system, and the act of slaveholding." Slavery as a system is unspeakably bad; but it does not follow that the "mere relation" in every case, is wicked. Yet if the "system" is so bad, then connexion with it is *presumptive evidence* of want of Christian character. Persons are to be received in Christian fellowship only on proof, that their individual connexion with it, is excusable.

Indeed this rule of discipline and evidence might be carried much further, as it has been of late by a large Convention of the Congregational ministers of Massachusetts and other States, assembled in Boston, May 31, 1849, who united in a public and solemn declaration of their views on the subject of Temperance.—They unanimously declare that admission to the Church was denied to those who drank or used intoxicating drinks in any degree, "*not because they might not in some cases be good men, but because while they continued this course, they did not give proper evidence of being good men.*" Nor was this considered as setting up a new test of evidence of religion, but it was viewed as

more correctly applying the Scriptural test, which through ignorance, had not been so correctly applied in such cases before."

Surely if the comparatively petty act of taking occasionally and moderately intoxicating drinks, may rightfully shut out even good men from the Church, because that one constructive sin, outweighed all the evidence of piety in his case—then the act of using cruel slave laws, to hold a fellow being in that most revolting condition—as a slave—a condition, which every MAN, in his own case would regard as the extremest evil and wrong,—may properly be deemed *prima facie* evidence of sin, justifying, nay demanding exclusion from the Church, until proof is rendered of the rightfulness of such slaveholding. Yet tens of thousands of such slaveholders are in the Presbyterian Church, without rebuke, question, or notice.

We are aware that reasoning of this kind is met by the assertion that "discipline is inflicted for bad treatment;" and that for the mere relation, with good treatment, discipline ought not to be inflicted. This topic has been already noticed, and it appears that the mass of slaveholding Church members do *not* merely "sustain a relation." They *hold* slaves—and exercise the powers and prerogatives of owners and masters. They are not and cannot be, sheltered therefore under the plea of a "mere relation."

Some suggestions have been already made as to the nature of this alleged kind treatment. Is it meant simply that unusual and torturing punishments are not inflicted? that the slaves have a sufficiency of food and clothing? We have reason to believe that these items constitute the amount of what is called kind treatment of a slave, in a slaveholder's nomenclature. But there still remain much cruel treatment, never noticed or considered such in slaveholding states. It is our opinion that kind treatment implies the following facts:—1st. That the slave have free permission to emigrate to any free state or country whenever he may choose. 2d. That he be retained in that most revolting condition, a slave, no longer than he pleases. 3d. That when he is hired out, he shall have a right to all his own earnings. 4th. That he shall never be struck after becoming a man or woman, without a fair trial, like any other man. 5th. That whether he work for his alleged owner, or some one else, he shall receive such wages as he may himself be willing to work for, like any other man.—6th. That he shall have a right to obtain all the education which he wishes for himself and his children, and to go when he thinks these advantages can be best procured.

Nothing less than this can be considered kind treatment towards MEN AND WOMEN. Any thing less than this we should consider as cruel and unchristian wrong towards ourselves. Now

if the slaveholding ministers and Church members at the South, render *such* treatment towards their slaves, then all difference between us is settled, and we cordially extend to them the right hand of fellowship. In that case, there is a "mere relation" which involves no blame on their part. But so far as our information extends, these items are not involved in the Southern idea of "good treatment:" and of course the proof of good treatment, as *they understand the term*, still leaves the prima facie evidence of gross wrong perpetrated on the slave as clear and strong as ever.

It has sometimes been argued, that the bodies, each styled "General Assembly" with whom we have ecclesiastical intercourse, have freed themselves from all responsibility in the matters discussed in this Report, by their repeated and explicit condemnation of the whole system of Slavery. But the facts which are alleged as proof of this position, constitute a part of the painful evidence that in this matter there is deep and mournful unsoundness calling for remonstrance and rebuke. True, the General Assembly has declared in 1818 that "the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another is utterly at variance with the law of God," and "a violation of the most sacred rights of man." What then have they done? Taken any measures to purge their Church of so foul a blot? Not in the least. There are now tens of thousands of their Church members habitually doing what is utterly at variance with the law of God. There have been in past times probably a *hundred thousand* and more of their Church members living in this enormous sin, according to their own acknowledgement; and yet there *never was a solitary case of discipline*, for participation in this public and notorious and acknowledged violation of the divine law.

It is plain therefore that for a long time this sin has been cherished in the bosom of their Church. For it is not to be supposed that these tens or hundreds of thousands of slaveholders, were all in such "*peculiar*" circumstances, that they were innocent or involuntary in their sin.

We are compelled therefore to take the ground that the Presbyterian Church, judged by her own confessions and statements, is deeply implicated in the guilt of upholding and sanctioning slavery. In 1787, the Synod of New-York and Philadelphia, then constituting the highest judicatory of the Church, declared, "they do highly approve the interest which many of the states have taken, *in promoting the abolition of slavery*:" thus distinctly recognizing its unchristian nature. Yet since that time they have allowed the number of slaveholding members and ministers in their Church to increase without a note of remonstrance or objection, and have repeatedly exalted slaveholders to the dignity of members and moderators in the General Assembly.

In 1795 the General Assembly "assured all the Churches under their care that they view with the deepest concern *any vestiges of slavery which may exist in our country.*" Yet during the subsequent fifty years slaveholding has increased; more of their own members are slaveholders; one of their theological seminaries is partly endowed by the ownership and sale of slaves; some of her own ministers are supported by jobbing out slaves; her Churches and Sessions admit thousands of slaveholders to membership without objecting to such slaveholding.

In 1818 the General Assembly declared "we consider the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another, as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ." Yet for thirty years from that time, they have admitted and retained tens of thousands of members, who are *habitually, publicly and notoriously living in a practice "totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principle of the Gospel."* They have selected for their moderators, men, who, according to their own solemn recorded judgment, were openly living in a public sin, "totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel." Nay, as if to make it plain that they (General Assembly, Old School) have since *deliberately adopted* this sin, they solemnly voted in 1845, "that it [slaveholding] *is no bar to Christian communion*, as it is found in the Southern portion of our country." We are thus compelled to see that the General Assembly, is not merely afflicted with a sin, which she is endeavoring in vain to remove—(as all Churches occasionally must be)—but has practically adopted and defended slaveholding, and introduced to her communion, tens of thousands of members, publicly living in a practice acknowledged to be "totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel!"

It is very true, that the General Assembly has *sint*, condemned in emphatic terms, "cruel treatment"—"undue severity"—and such like modes of treatment. But such facts only compel us to revert again to the true meaning of such terms in slaveholding nomenclatures. *What is cruel treatment?* Is it not cruel treatment, to deprive a man, woman or child of personal liberty, without crime proved or alleged? Is it not cruel to *retain* a human being in a condition in which he can never appeal to the laws for protection against any crime however atrocious? Is it not cruel to take advantage of any laws, which authorize us to compel a brother man to work for us without wages? Is it not cruel to "violate the most precious and sacred rights of human nature?" Yet these and other things are necessarily involved in each individual case of *voluntary* slaveholding. We are compelled therefore to remain unsatisfied with these disclaimers and condemnations of cruel treatment: for we thus see that the slave may be

"*well treated*," and "*kindly dealt with*," at a slave in the honest estimation of the slaveholder and those who sympathize with him, while at the same time, nearly all the rights of that slave, as a man and those most precious and sacred, are habitually outraged.

It is impossible therefore, for the undersigned to concur in the views of those who think that either of the General Assemblies have taken higher ground in relation to slavery of late years than that on which they formerly stood. Their strongest and purest declarations were made *thirty or fifty years* ago. Recently the matter has been to some extent discussed in their meetings: and their former statements have been re-affirmed. But such facts only bring out into more startling prominence the humiliating truth, that tens of thousands of Church members, participating actively in "enslaving one part of the human race," a sin which they know to be a public sin — which they know to be "totally at variance with the law of God" and "utterly irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel"—are still received and retained in the Church. There is surely no indication of progress in the right direction, when no principles are put forth now which were not advanced fifty years ago: and when the number of slaveholders in the Church is much greater than it was then.

It might be difficult at any one time to begin to affect the ecclesiastical standing of members already in the Church. But there could be no valid objection to applying the principles of the Gospel to those who are to be admitted. Yet for fifty years, and at the present time, the Presbyterian Church *continues to admit*, those who "enslave one part of the human race," without questioning them as to their participation in that fearful sin.

Neither can the undersigned concur in the friendly excuse, which he hears from all quarters, for the present position of the Presbyterian Church. He is often assured "that Southern Christians are in the dark"—"that the Churches at the South are a hundred years behind the age"—"that in their circumstances, they cannot be expected to have the light, and enlightened consciences which we at the North have"—"that we are to make the same apology for them, which we do for the falsehood and polygamy of Abraham"—"that with them, slaveholding is a sin of ignorance."

It is unnecessary to say that these excuses, though made in the most friendly spirit, are far from being complimentary to our Southern brethren, and would no doubt be rejected by them. Indeed the testimonies which they gave thirty and fifty years ago, denouncing "the enslaving of one part of the human race"—slaveholding—prove that they were fully aware of the enormous criminality of the act—and of the wrongs necessarily involved in it:

that they are not "in the dark," but do know what it is which they receive into the Church.

Moreover the undersigned humbly submits, that if the apology here alluded to is founded in truth: if our Southern brethren are "in the dark"—then that fact constitutes even a stronger reason for some action on the part of the Association. If God in his providence has placed us in friendly relations with a Church, so far behind the spirit of the age and the spirit of the Gospel, then it is plainly our duty to exert ourselves with the utmost earnestness to give them light. We are bound to argue and expostulate with them with Christian faithfulness, and without ceasing; we should allow no opportunity to pass without setting before them our solemn testimony as to their position and sin. Unless we do so, we cannot relieve ourselves from an intelligent and deliberate participation in that sin, which in them is a sin of ignorance. "Who knoweth whether we are come [to a better light] for such a time as this?"

At this stage of the argument we are met by an appeal to the Scriptures, considered by those who propose it as final and unanswerable. It is stated in somewhat this form. "There were slaveholders in the primitive Churches; slaveholders admitted by the Apostles, or allowed to be in the Churches without rebuke from the Apostles, and receiving only directions how to conduct as slaveholders. We have then divine authority for the admission of slaveholders to the Church. We have no right to reject from the Church those whom the Apostles admitted; and still less right to demand that our sister Churches shall set up an unscriptural or anti-scriptural test of Church membership; and of course ought not to expostulate with them when they are only imitating the action of the Apostles."

To the facts as alleged, we reply

1st. That modern Churches have not considered themselves bound to a literal imitation of Apostolic example in laying down the conditions of Church membership, but have considered themselves at liberty, while adhering to the general principles of the Bible, to apply those principles to the changing exigencies of society. Thus for instance, in some of the Churches founded by the missionaries of the American Board, a body which has been very cautious to adjust its modes of procedure to the standard of the Bible as they understand it—they make a pledge of total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, a condition of Church membership. Now it has never been pretended that the Apostles ever required any such pledge from those whom they admitted to the Church, although there was intemperance in primitive Churches. But the demand for such a condition in those Churches must be justified from the fact that circumstances justified them in thus departing from a literal imitation of Apostolic example: or rath-

er they allege, that by requiring this condition, they are, in *their circumstances*, carrying out the true idea of the Apostles in establishing Churches, which was to bring in converted men, and keep out bad men. The American Board, has never hinted any disapprobation of this departure from Apostolic example, though very vigilant and circumspect in adhering to Scripture.

Yet further: some Churches sustained by the American Board, excommunicate members *who use tobacco*: a condition which surely cannot be drawn from any literal example of the Apostles. The General Assembly, after long deliberation, did by solemn vote recommend to the thousands of Churches under their care, to discipline those members who practised *dancing*, a course for which they could plead no rule or precedent from Scripture, and which they only justified by the allegation, that these plans and recommendations, *under present exigencies*, were adapted in their view to preserve the purity and holiness of the Churches.

The Committee find a precedent in point in the recent case of the Rev. Baptist Noel, of England. It is well known that he has withdrawn from the Episcopal Church, and his separation with the reasons for it, have met with general approbation among the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of the United States: at least we have seen in none of the papers patronized by those denominations, any censure passed on him or his arguments. In justification of his course he says, "I have long had doubts about the propriety of a connection between the Church and the State." "I have come to agree with a writer, that a man is responsible for the sins of a communion to which he belongs," and "therefore I have determined that I must leave you."

All these arguments apply with peculiar force to the case now under consideration. The connection between Slavery and the Church, or rather the cherished existence within the Church of slaveholding, "utterly at variance with the law of God"—"a violation of the most sacred rights of man"—"founded in unrighteousness," is far more doubtful than a mere connection between Church and State. When a sin like that, is intelligently and deliberately and perseveringly maintained in the Church, each member of that Church "is responsible for the sins of the denomination," and must be bound solemnly to protest or withdraw, or both.

If then, precedents are worth any thing, we have abundant precedent for taking a course, in the circumstances before us, not in literal imitation of the example of the Apostles. If we may in *any case*, depart from Apostolic example, then such departure does not, in and of itself prove a given case of departure to be wrong. We are left to argue the point on the general grounds of a holy expediency. The question after all still remains, whether slavery is not *under present circumstances* such an abomination, such a

violation of right and justice, as to call for the discipline of the Church. The alleged departure then from a literal imitation of the Apostles, proves nothing as to the case now before us, even if there were any such departure, which of itself admits of grave doubt.

2d. But still further: it is an admitted principle in the application of precedents, that they must prove the *precise point*, for which they are adduced. If they do not touch that point, they prove nothing at all. Now what is the *precise point* in question, between us and those who differ from us. Is it this, *whether slaveholders should be admitted to the Church?* If so, then the fact that slaveholders were admitted to Apostolic Churches, would be a precedent precisely in point, though subject to qualifications stated under the first head. But that is not the question. The point now to be decided is this. The Churches with whom we correspond, admit slaveholders, as such, to the Church, *without demanding any proof in individual cases*, that his particular slaveholding is right, or extenuated by his individual circumstances. What we maintain is, that while slaveholders may be admitted to the Church, yet the system is such an outrage on human rights — one involving “such a gross violation of the most sacred rights of human nature,” that no slaveholder ought to be admitted or retained in the Church, *without proof that his connection with such a system of abominations is an innocent or justifiable one.*

Now if precedents are sought in Apostolic example, they must be *precedents of the very thing to be proved.* Those who differ from us are bound then not only to shew, that the Apostles admitted slaveholders, *but that they admitted them without demanding proof from each individual that his connection with the system was justifiable*, or at least so extenuated as to be consistent with Christian character. They must prove this, or they prove nothing. But is this proved? By no means. It is never even attempted. If challenged to the proof they would unquestionably answer,—there is no such proof: the Scriptures are profoundly silent on the subject: they give us no information at all as to the questions or tests in detail, which the Apostles applied to those who wished for admission to their Churches. Very well: we accept the reply. But in what condition then is the argument left? Why just here: that *on the very point, on which we differ the Scriptures say nothing.* For the question on which we differ is not, whether there were actually some persons in the primitive Churches, who sustained the relation of slaveholders. That we admit fully, for the sake of the argument—(though by no means prepared to do so in reality,) but here, we concede freely that some slaveholders *were* members of the primitive Churches.

But Southern Churches admit slaveholders without demanding any proof that individual slaveholders who ask admission to their Churches, are justified in sustaining that relation. For that course, we ask Scriptural authority. They produce none. The propriety of this course they maintain; we deny. They as maintaining the affirmation are bound to the proof: and by the nature of argument, to the proof from Scripture, or their position entirely falls.

Since then on the very point on which we differ there is no precedent nor Scripture proof exactly to the point, we are left to apply to the case, the general principles of the Scriptures. What are these principles and how applied. Thus as we conceive.

American slavery is a system of abominations: "a violation of the most sacred rights of human nature" — "founded on injustice and violence" — "the sum of all villainies" — "utterly at variance with the laws of God." Connection with such a system is *prima facie* evidence of wrong doing and of a bad heart: just as connection with the business of traffic in intoxicating drinks, is *prima facie* evidence of wrong — just as one's habitual and voluntary presence in a gambling house, is *prima facie* evidence of wrong — just as often being seen entering a house of bad fame, is *prima facie* evidence of being wrong.

As we know that it was a fundamental aim of the Apostles to rear up holy Churches, filled with holy members, we have a right to assert, that they would not admit persons voluntarily connected with such a system of abominations, without a careful inquiry into the nature of their connection, without ascertaining whether in each particular case, the individual was justified in retaining this connection. We have a right to make this inference, just as certainly, as without any explicit declaration either way, we have a right to infer, that the Apostles, when admitting persons once connected with any *other* of the systems of abomination then prevailing in the Roman empire, would inquire into the candidates' present views, on that particular abomination.

Now what have they to allege against this. Not a fact — not the shadow of a fact. They say that slaveholders were members of the primitive Churches. Very well, we admit that; and admit further, that they may be so now, *if their continuance in slaveholding can be proved to be just.* BUT THAT MUST BE PROVED,

In view of the previous facts and arguments, the following resolutions are proposed for the consideration of the Association:

"Whereas this Association has long viewed with deep sorrow the fearful prevalence of slaveholding among the members and ministers of the Presbyterian Churches in the slaveholding States,

And whereas believing as we do the dangerous tendency of this

sin, and moreover assenting to the solemn judgment of the General Assembly that slaveholding "is utterly at variance with the law of God," and "is a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature"—we have hoped that the proper judicatories of the Presbyterian Churches would take decided measures to call each slaveholder in the Church to account, and allow no slaveholding but that "which on examination had been proved to be involuntary or necessary."

And whereas we have reason to believe that such investigation is never made, but that slaveholders are received and retained in the Church, and that they are not required to render to their *slaves* the treatment which is due to *men and women*; but do systematically withhold from their slaves the rights of men;

Therefore resolved, that we do hereby express to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, our deep regret for such fellowship with slaveholding; we would remonstrate with them for thus encouraging a system of demoralizing and dangerous tendencies, and convey to them our ardent wishes that for the honor of our common Christianity, they would speedily aim to remove this sin from their Churches.

Resolved, that our delegates to the next meeting of the General Assembly be directed to present the foregoing Report and Resolutions to that body."

All which is respectfully submitted,

G. W. PERKINS.

Meriden, June 15, 1849.

THE AMERICAN BOARD AND THE INDIANS.

WE are continually inquired of respecting the action of the A. B. C. F. M. on the subject of American Slavery. Our earliest friends, who know the principles upon which the Association was established, and who have regularly perused our columns and kindred papers, are well aware of the necessity that existed for statements showing the reasons of our dissent from the policy of the Board. They are aware also that, owing to the present position of the Board on the great question that agitates this country, there is greater necessity now than ever before of an anti-slavery missionary organization. But numbers, who have more recently contributed to our funds, and expressed their cordial approval of our general views, do not so fully understand the relative position of the two Boards. It is in compliance with such intimations, and requests founded upon them, that we have felt it our duty to give such a presentation of the subject, embracing facts already stated from time to time in our columns, and other information, as will enable our readers to take a comprehensive view of the whole matter. We shall aim to perform this task with fidelity and kindness, and presume that no sincere and candid inquirer after truth will refuse to give a prayerful and dispassionate consideration to what we shall present.

Correspondents of some of the Western religious newspapers, who were present at the late meeting of the Board at Troy, N. Y., have expressed their great disappointment and grief that nothing was said *against* slavery and mission churches contaminated with slavery, but much to *extol* 'slaveholding' churches sustained by the Board. It seemed to them, as it did to numerous other friends of missions in attendance, that unusual pains were taken to make such churches, and the missionaries present who are connected with them, special objects of attention and commendation, and to encourage the idea that the meetings of the Board were spiritual just in proportion to the partial or absolute exclusion of the slavery question. One of the correspondents referred to says :

"A corporate member, residing at the West, was asked if it would be possible to get the sin of slaveholding, as practised in the mission churches, before the Board? His reply was, that the thing would be utterly impossible. He said that it was his opinion that even a corporate member, who should attempt to introduce the excluded subject, would be 'discountenanced'—*kindly*, but *firmly* 'put down.' So every man must feel who attends a single session of this Board. . . . While in the American Congress the subject of slavery can be discussed, the American Board has succeeded in absolutely excluding the consideration of this same evil with which their churches are immediately connected. . . . No Christian can give a good reason for giving his means to propagate the gospel connected with slavery, when he can send a free gospel to the heathen. Let us labor then to disseminate truth. Christ and the Christian's conscience are on our side; and although we shall not live in this world to see the issue, yet we shall see it. All who labor in faith for free missions will unite in the hallelujah which will ring through the arches of the spirit's home, when the last vestiges of slavery shall be expelled from the Church of Christ."

Inasmuch as a large number of Christian people think and reason thus, and believe that the Board has been and still is grievously in error with respect to sustaining missions connected with slaveholding, the prominence given at Troy to the Choctaw and Cherokee missions, and the missionaries who were there to represent them, may have arisen from a desire to refute the objections made by anti-slavery Christians. It may have been thought that statements, showing the outward prosperity of those missions under the auspices of the Board, and the Divine blessing said to be manifested towards them, notwithstanding their implication with slaveholding, would prove that the policy pursued by the Board and the missionaries accords with the will of the Great Head of the Church. If this were the object, we think, from what we have seen and read since the annual meeting, that the Christian public, particularly the influential ministers and laymen of the West, have not received such an impression. It seems impossible that special marks of approbation are bestowed upon missions that connive at enslaving men, buying and selling human beings, and admitting, as a matter of course, slaveholders and slave-sellers, or, as the Bible describes them, "men-stealers," who "give evidences of piety," to the Lord's table.

In the paper emanating from the Prudential Committee, that was read at the annual meeting, it was said:

"A large number of the Choctaws are the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . One eighth of the whole tribe belong to the visible Church. . . . No other cluster of churches in the world, it is believed, can show such a table of statistics (additions) for the last twelve years. . . . In some things, moreover, these churches are ensamples to us. . . . Choctaw Christians pray much for the heathen. . . . Intemperance among the Choctaws has been greatly curtailed. . . . Through the efforts of the missionaries a law was passed in 1823, embracing the principles of what is now known as the 'Maine Law,' but which, with greater propriety, may be called the 'Choctaw Law.' . . . The Choctaws are an agricultural people. . . . Education is highly prized by the Choctaws. . . . Mr. Hotchkin (the missionary) thinks that the Choctaw Christians, according to their ability, are more benevolent than their white brethren. . . . And Mr. Stark says: 'If all Christians would give as liberally as the Good Water church, the gospel would soon be sent to the whole heathen world.' . . . The Choctaws have a good government. They have a written constitution, with a 'declaration of rights' which embodies the liberty of the press, trial by jury, the rights of conscience, proper safeguards of person and property, the equality of all Christian denominations, and almost every great principle of civil and religious freedom. . . . The statutes of the Choctaws are simple, sometimes defective in phraseology, but for the most part commendable in their aims and spirit."

Of the Cherokees it was said:

"I know not how many cases of triumph in the hour of death might be produced to show that Cherokees and negroes have had the same happy exit from the world as the more highly favored whites. . . . 'Those whom we received into our churches,' Mr. Ranney thinks, 'on the whole give as much evidence of being born again as did church members in Vermont, when I lived there.' . . . The Cherokees, like other Indians, are hospitable to a proverb; and it would seem that they only need to be taught the 'more excellent way,' to open their hearts to all the world. . . . The Cherokees are struggling manfully against the evils of intemperance. . . . The Cherokees have made great improvements in agriculture. . . . The Cherokees are advancing in knowledge. . . . The Cherokees have an excellent government. In form it closely resembles that of Massachusetts. . . . All free male citizens, eighteen years of age, are entitled to vote, the vote being *viva voce*. . . . The usual safeguards for person and property, the rights of conscience, &c., are provided. . . . The second Chief, the three members of the Executive Council, and three judges (out of five) of the Supreme Court, are professors of religion."

Similar statements were made with regard to other Indian missions. Who, after reading such high-wrought encomiums, would expect to see, prefixed to them, the following extraordinary sentences?—"The Board is now fully committed, wisely or unwisely, to the work of evangelizing the aborigines of this country. Two centuries have elapsed since the purpose of giving 'the unsearchable riches of Christ' to the red man was first conceived. It has enjoyed the prestige of royal charters. It has had the cordial support of some of the noblest men that ever lived. It has been hallowed by the prayers and the tears of a great company of 'the faithful.' But WHERE ARE THE PRESENT FRUITS? ALAS! THEY ARE VERY FEW." We shall be able to throw some light upon this subject in the sequel, and probably solve the paradox. Far be it from us to undervalue the labors of the missionaries among the Choctaws and Cherokees, or to deny that good has been done at the missions. Wherever and by whomsoever souls are converted, we "therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." But if, as we can show, the gospel has not been preached to these Indians in its fulness; if it has been partially misrepresented; if thereby obstructions have been placed in the way of the genuine conversion of large numbers, while dishonor has been cast upon Christianity, we cannot refrain from uttering the truth on the subject, while we earnestly call upon the friends of God and man candidly to examine the facts, and do all in their power to correct the evil.

In the paper already alluded to it is said: "Of the laws which relate to slavery the Committee have no occasion to speak, as they were laid before the Board four years ago. It is supposed, however, that the Choctaw people entertain more enlightened views on this whole subject than the adjacent States." However this may be, we shall lay before our readers some of those laws, taken from Mr. Treat's Report of 1848, and they will be able to judge how far the law-makers, who were influential members of the mission churches, are entitled to the praise bestowed upon them by the Committee.

Mr. Treat reported in 1848 that there was a statute of the Cherokee Nation which debars alike the free negro and the slave from all direct access to "the lively oracles." It is as follows: "*Be it enacted by the National Council, That from and after the passage of this Act, it shall not be lawful for any person or persons whatever to teach any free negro or negroes not of Cherokee blood, or any slave belonging to any citizen or citizens of the Nation, to read or write.*" The penalty annexed to a violation of this enactment is a fine of \$100 to \$500, at the discretion of the Court trying the offense. Mr. Treat remarks: "This law is the more to be regretted, as it must needs embarrass the mission in its efforts to benefit this injured and neglected portion of the community."

No free negro or mulatto, not of Cherokee blood, may hold or own any *improvement* in the Nation. Slaves are prohibited from owning horses, cattle, hogs or fire-arms. "Patrol companies may take up and bring to punishment any negro not having a legal pass that [who] may be strolling about away from the premises of his master; and any negro not entitled to Cherokee privileges, who may be found carrying guns, butcher knives, &c., is liable to the summary infliction, by the patrol companies, of forty stripes save one."

The legislation of the Choctaws, says Mr. Treat, has been less enlightened and humane than that of the Cherokees. So long ago as October, 1836, the following law was passed by this tribe:

"*Be it enacted, &c., That from and after the passage of this Act, if any citizen of the United States, acting as a missionary, or a preacher, or whatever his occupation may be, is found to take an active part in favoring the principles and notions of*

the most fatal and destructive doctrines of Abolitionism, he shall be compelled to leave the nation and for ever stay out of it.

"Be it further enacted, &c., That teaching slaves how to read, to write, or to sing in meeting-houses or schools, or in any open place, without the consent of the owner, or allowing them to sit at table with him, shall be sufficient ground to convict persons of favoring the principles and notions of Abolitionism."

"Less enlightened and humane," truly!

It was provided also that no slave should "be in possession of any property or arms;" that if any slave infringed any Choctaw rights, he should "be driven out of company, to behave himself;" and in case of his return and further intrusion "he should receive ten lashes." Four years later it was enacted that all free negroes in the Nation, unconnected with the Choctaw or Chickasaw blood, "should leave the Nation by the first of March, 1841," and "for ever keep out of it." In case of their infringing this law, "they were to be seized and sold to the highest bidder for life." It was also enacted that if any citizen of the Nation hired, concealed, or in any way protected any free negro, to evade the foregoing provision, (did *our* Congressional legislators copy from these Indians in framing the Fugitive Slave Act?) he should forfeit from \$250 to \$500, or if unable to pay this fine, "receive fifty lashes on his bare back."

In 1846 a law was passed, which prohibited all negroes, whether they had "papers" or not, from entering and remaining in the Choctaw Nation. The offenders were to receive "not less than one-hundred lashes on the bare back," beside a forfeiture of all property found in their possession, one third "to go to the light horsemen," who apprehended them, and two thirds "to be applied to some beneficial purpose."

The most objectionable enactment, says Mr. Treat, which he found, having any bearing upon slavery, was approved October 15th, 1846. It is as follows:

"Be it enacted, &c., That no negro slave can be emancipated in this Nation, except by application or petition of the owner to the General Council; and provided also, that it shall be made to appear to the Council the owner or owners, at the time of application, shall have no debt or debts outstanding against him or her, either in or out of this Nation. Then, and in that case, the General Council shall have the power to pass an act for the owner to emancipate his or her slave, which negro, after being freed, shall leave this Nation within thirty days after the passage of the act. And in case said free negro or negroes shall return into this Nation afterwards, he, she, or they shall be subject to be taken by the light horsemen and exposed to public sale for the term of five years; and the funds arising from such sale shall be used as national funds."

These extracts will suffice. Our readers will have now in their possession facts sufficient to enable them to form a satisfactory opinion how far the missionaries are correct in stating that "the Choctaws, according to their ability, are more benevolent than the whites;" that those received into the Cherokee churches, "on the whole give as much evidence of being born again as did church members in Vermont." They will be prepared to judge also whether the Committee erred, or not, in announcing that "the Choctaws have a good government"; . . . a written Constitution, with a 'declaration of rights' which embodies the liberty of the press, trial by jury, the rights of conscience, proper safeguards of personal property, the equality of all Christian denominations, and almost every great principle of civil and religious freedom. . . . The statutes of the Choctaws are simple, sometimes defective in phraseology, but, for the most part, commendable in their aims and spirit." And, likewise, whether the Cherokees deserve to have it said of them, "The Cherokees

have an excellent government. . . . The usual safeguards for person and property, the rights of conscience, &c., are provided."

The Christian world will be astonished, we think, when they come to know that 'Christian' men, capable of enacting such atrocious laws, are represented by the most influential Missionary Board in this country as being "followers of the Lord Jesus Christ," and as ensamples to the white Christians of the United States. They will also marvel that slaveholding converts, men who brutalize and keep in heathenish ignorance their fellow-men, are represented as praying "much for the heathen." And what will the citizens of the Old Bay State say of the declaration of the Committee, who themselves are inhabitants of that Commonwealth, that the Cherokees have an excellent government—in form resembling that of Massachusetts—all the free male citizens, eighteen years of age, being entitled to vote, the vote being *viva voce*?

Well might Mr. Treat say, notwithstanding the high standard assigned to the Indians, after enumerating these atrocious enactments, "It is very clear, moreover, that the influence of the mission is neutralized, to some extent, by the existence of slavery." And although he believes that "the influence of Christianity has been highly salutary . . . it seems fair to presume that a few persons have been led by Christian principle to abstain from the purchase of slaves, and such I was told was the case," he feels constrained to say that "we may not shut our eyes to the fact that a process has been silently going forward which has tended to a different result." And the evil is daily increasing, for he also admits that slavery increases as the Indians become more enlightened like the people around them, and "it does not seem to have been the aim of the brethren to exert any *direct* influence, either by their public or their private teachings, upon the system of slavery."

"The predominant influence in both nations," says Mr. Treat, "is in the hands of slaveholders." It is so, he might have added, in the mission churches. But he goes on to say, "THE MASS OF THE PEOPLE HAVE NO DIRECT INTEREST IN SLAVERY." What encouragement then to the missionaries to be faithful, explicit, uncompromising in their teachings! To coöperate with the churches in strict discipline! What obligation resting upon the Board to influence their missionaries to such fidelity! And what error, not to say guilt, in adopting a different "policy"! That it is practicable, in imitation of the fidelity of the first sermon of the Apostle Peter to the murderers of the Saviour, to preach an anti-slavery gospel to kings as well as subjects, has been proved by the missionaries of the American Missionary Association in Africa, who have from the beginning done it with the happiest success. Is not such preaching the obvious duty and best "policy" of all missionaries? It is strange that missionaries and missionary boards every where do not understand it.

In some cases, says Mr. Treat, "the attention of the convert (slaveholding) has been called to the instructions of the New Testament, and he has been told what he should do, as a Christian master, for his slaves; but *seldom has the missionary gone further than this.*" He adds, when alluding to some of the earliest "converts," "They (the missionaries) did not consider the mere fact of his sustaining this relation (that of a slaveholder) a barrier to his admission to the Lord's table. *And it is their practice at the present time.*" Indeed! Mr. Treat goes on to say, "The relation of the Christian master to his slaves, either as to its lawfulness or its continuance, they (the missionaries) have not disturbed; and little has been said to him, calling in question the fundamental principles of the system." And then, singularly enough we think, adds, "But they have acknowledged their obligation to secure, as far as in them lies, his compliance with all the injunctions of the New Testament, which are

specifically addressed to those sustaining this relation ;" as if it were clear that the apostles, when alluding to "servants," meant of course SLAVES.

Considering the remarkable success of the missionaries at these missions, in many respects, in inducing the Indians to be patterns of temperance, to enact a law in 1828, that has been imitated by the State of Maine ; to be liberal in bestowments of money for education and charitable purposes ; in persuading a few persons to abstain from buying slaves, it is right to suppose that if they had preached fully and perseveringly on the sin and criminality of slaveholding and slave-trading ; if they had expounded the Scriptures as hostile to the iniquity ; if they had instituted a wholesome discipline with reference to such offenders, they would have long since prevented slaveholding, or banished it from the tribes, at least from the churches. Instead of doing this, the Indians have been permitted to believe that the gospel allowed slaveholding and slave-trading—allowed one church member to buy or sell a brother or sister in the church—allowed atrocious enactments to be framed by 'Christian' legislators, and administered by 'Christian' judges ! Shall such things be, and no one be suffered, without censure, to lift up his voice in condemnation of the "policy," and exhort brethren in Christ to adopt a better course ?

In view of the hallucination of the missionaries on this subject, it appears singular that Mr. Treat says of them, without accompanying the fact stated with deserved censure : "I ought to say, in this place, however, that both missions appear to be satisfied that there has been little or nothing in the conduct of this class of persons, (slaveholding church members,) as it affects their slaves, which ought to subject them to church censure." Will it be credited a few years hence, that such missionaries, however excellent men in other respects, were sustained by the American Board to bring the poor Indians to the knowledge of the truth !

It appears that since the anti-slavery agitation commenced, the Board at first instructed the missionaries among the south-western Indians to enter into no more contracts for buying slaves, as had been previously done, "with the funds of the Board," with their own consent, with the understanding and agreement that they should be allowed to work out the purchase money, and then be free, and to "relinquish all claim to the services of any one with whom there had been a previous agreement of the kind ;" and afterwards instructed them not to *hire* slaves, but "to dispense altogether with slave labor"—although *this was afterwards reconsidered*. "The matter was left," says Mr. Treat, "to their Christian discretion." We see herein the influence that was exerted on the Board, for a time, by anti-slavery discussion, and the unfortunate retracing of steps, at the urgent remonstrance of the missionaries, and when public opinion seemed to require it. The practice of buying slaves, as above described, or hiring them of their masters, is a *quasi-slavery*, and gives an implied sanction to the system, called by WILBERFORCE the "accursed system of slavery." Total abstinence from all approval, or seeming approval, of it, one would think was the obvious duty of every Christian, especially of a society of Christians associated for the conversion of the heathen world.

Facts show that a number of the members of the Choctaw and Cherokee Churches, founded and sustained by the Board, are slaveholders, claiming the right to buy and sell slaves who are members of the same churches with themselves ; that both masters and slaves are received into the mission churches, the Board intimating, in their Brooklyn Report, that this is the way to prepare the master to consent to emancipation ; that the Board, while admitting that slavery is an evil in the mission churches, denies that it is responsible for its removal ; that slaves have been hired of their 'owners' to do the work of the mission schools, and the wages

paid by them to the masters; that the missionaries assert their intention to hire slaves if necessary; that they vindicate the practice of receiving persistent slaveholders to their churches as scriptural; that the Board has constituted these missionaries and their churches *SOLE judges on the subject*; and that contributors to the Board's funds must *perpetually*, so far as any thing contrary appears, contribute to the propagation of a slaveholding Christianity.

The facts presented to the Christian public by anti-slavery writers, and the resolutions adopted by anti-slavery Christian conventions, and the remonstrances addressed to the Board by anti-slavery members, in view of the facts above enumerated, in conjunction with the strong anti-slavery feeling aroused in the community, did, for a time, so influence the Secretaries and Prudential Committee of the Board, that the Secretaries said, at the meeting of the Board at Buffalo, 1847, that "they had every possible disposition to remove slavery, and every other evil and sin, as speedily as possible from the mission churches." Mr. Treat was accordingly appointed to visit them. While there, he ascertained the facts in relation to the strong hold slavery had taken in the Indian missions, which he embodied in an able report. It was understood that, finding the missionaries inflexible with regard to the course pursued by them, he endeavoured to rid the Board of the odium fast gathering in the religious community by laboring to bring the missionaries to aid in accomplishing a transfer of the Choctaw mission to the Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions, so that the mission would pass under the immediate control of the Old School Presbyterians of the Southwest, whose sympathies on the question of slavery were more in harmony with those of the slaveholders in the mission churches than were those of many of the supporters of the American Board. It is said that the missionaries resisted this attempt. We rejoice that they did; for its success would have been an evasion of the subject unworthy of a Christian society.

Mr. Treat returned to Boston, and addressed a faithful letter to the Choctaw mission, that did him and the mission cause great honor. In this letter, the Prudential Committee declare explicitly that, to them, it seemed "very clear, that slavery is opposed to the principles of the gospel . . . that the Board could never have intended that slaveholders should be received to church membership, without inquiring as to their views and feelings in regard to slavery." And for admitting one who "holds and treats those for whom Christ died with a selfish spirit and for selfish purposes," to the privileges of the people of God, "especially in the advanced stage at which the mission has arrived," they "know of no warrant whatever;" that "it is an anti-Christian system, and hence you have a right to deal with it accordingly. . . . We are grieved to hear that the Choctaws have a law which practically debars the slave from all direct access to the Word of God, without the consent of the owner." It was supposed to indicate the course resolved upon by the "Prudential Committee," in relation to slavery in the mission churches, and was hailed with delight by anti-slavery Christians, and by a large portion of the friends of the Board. The 'pro-slavery' missionaries, however, and the pro-slavery newspapers, secular and religious, uttered their dissatisfaction so loudly and perseveringly, that the Secretaries appeared to be alarmed, and published an apologetic and deprecatory circular, in which they said that Mr. Treat's letter merely expressed "opinions," but not "decisions or instructions." While the anti-slavery friends of the Board generally lamented this "bowing down to the spirit of slavery," the 'pro-slavery' adherents of the Board greatly exulted.

One devoted and efficient missionary found it impossible to continue in the Choctaw

taw mission, as an anti-slavery minister, without compromising his usefulness or his conscience; and left to labor among the Indians of Minnesota Territory.

Another, writing to Mr. Treat from the Choctaw Nation, in the fall of 1848, says: "I am fully convinced this mission must be supported by those who are willing and disposed to give their influence in the support and in the propagation of slavery in the Christian Church. For years past, the gospel, as brought to bear upon this people, has had an indirect influence to propagate and build up this system of wrong and oppression. I am sorry, in justice to truth, to say, in some respects it has had a direct tendency to it."

In another letter of February 24th, 1849, this same missionary writes: "I could labor here with cheerfulness and contentedness, could I but see the gospel exerting an influence tending indirectly to the gradual extinction of this system, (slavery;) but when I see the *system gaining strength and consolidating itself in proportion to the advancement of the people in Christianized life*, and no influence whatever exerted by the mission to retard the accelerated increase of it, I think the time has fully come for Congregational Christians (this missionary is a Congregationalist) to raise the inquiry—What must be done? And if it is decided, as doubtless it will be decided by the mission, that nothing ought to be done, the Lord whom I serve calls me to leave the mission. The call appears to me as clearly from heaven as my call to the work of the sacred ministry."

Two members of the American Board's mission among the Sioux wrote a letter, published in the *Central Watchman*, Cincinnati, expressive of their views. After alluding to the difficulty of correcting the error, "when slavery is once introduced into a mission church—baptized and brought to the communion table," they continue:

"The time for retraction and correction in this case, it would seem, has gone by. They appear now to be *committed* to the system of slavery, just as the Southern churches are. Not only are they unable to free their churches of the slaveholders who at present have a standing in them, but they must continue to receive such to the communion table. And further, the missionaries there *cannot do without employing slave labor*. We are told that at one of the stations, flour has to be hauled forty miles; and therefore, slave help is necessary, would seem to be the inference. By that reasoning it would be much more necessary for us at Lacquiparle to hire slaves, as we have a land carriage of one hundred and twenty-five miles. But with them there is a more substantial reason than this. *They must employ slave labor as an evidence of loyalty to this 'peculiar institution.'* If they are unwilling to hire slaves, it is *prima facie* evidence that they are abolitionists. For this reason, if for no other, they must hire slaves. In their succumbing to these humiliating requisitions of slavery, we can have no sympathy with them . . .

"If the Choctaw boarding schools *cannot* be sustained without the assistance of slaves, then let the missionaries withdraw from them. And if the missionaries cannot continue to reside there without employing slave labor, and if they may not, by example and precept, bear testimony against the sin of holding men as property, then let them return."

We have reason to know that many of the missionaries of the Board, on this continent and in foreign lands, felt deeply grieved at this retrograde step of the Committee, and if they had felt free to proclaim their sentiments, would have used similar language, justly considering that every missionary was interested in the decision of the Board on such a momentous question, while they knew that a right decision would have inspired them all with more intrepidity and zeal, and would have aided them in doing more good among the heathen, with whom slavery, in some form or other, always prevails. One missionary of another Board, (the A. H. M. Society,) laboring in a slave State, untrammelled by associates, and unawed by a vicious public sentiment wrote as follows:

"Another thing that I should, perhaps, mention as ENCOURAGING, is the growing opposition to slavery. The pulpit can now speak out on this subject, and men will hear. Some are taking an active part in the organization of the emancipation party at our election for members of the Convention next year. We are determined to remove this great difficulty in our way, or die in the attempt. As Christians, and as freemen, we will suffer this libel on our religion and institutions to exist no longer.

"I feel that we owe it to God and to the oppressed race in the midst of us, to exhibit the whole truth in regard to this matter. I shall, however, be careful not to permit my influence or my ministerial character to suffer. As far as possible, I will carry out the Saviour's precept to be wise as a serpent and harmless as a dove."

Another, not so *apostolic* in his views of duty, and more ignorant of the Christian philosophy that leads an ambassador of Christ fearlessly and uncompromisingly to preach the TRUTH, in certain belief that thus the great ends of preaching the true gospel will be better answered than by preaching an emasculated gospel, [because, to one lacking faith, it may appear more expedient,] while acknowledging the obstacle slavery places in the missionary's path, writes in a different strain, as follows :

"There is ONLY ONE THING that hinders our entire happiness, and that is the curse of SLAVERY. But of this I may not now speak. God grant that our conduct, while here, may not go to sanction this evil. But to come out openly, and avow hostility to the 'sacred' institution, would be to thwart all hopes of doing good, and insure us a speedy passport from the country."

This fearful missionary seemed to have forgotten the words of his Divine Master, when he said, "And whosoever shall not receive you nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house, or city, shake off the dust of your feet." He however added his testimony to the true character of slavery. It is a system that not only hinders the happiness of missionaries, but, if acquiesced in, renders it impossible to build up churches of intelligent and consistent Christians.

While the act of the Secretaries, in retracing their steps, was under discussion before the Christian public, the Boston *Congregationalist* said, with equal shrewdness and independence: "We believe the American Board has vast interests depending on its action in reference to the slavery question. We are confident that a decided support of the principles of Mr. Treat's letter will be necessary to save to the Board a large amount of confidence and patronage which has been continued to it during the past year, only in the *hope* of such action." The New-York *Independent* also, notwithstanding it had counselled the Board to get rid of the 'vexed question' by transferring the Choctaw mission to the Old School Assembly's Board, now uttered its voice of expostulation and counsel, as follows :

"The progress of opinion, and the developments of experience, have raised questions and obstacles which the Board must meet, and which will affect them seriously, whatever course they may take. Thus, for instance, the slavery question, in its present form, was unknown thirty years ago. But the Board seems to forget this, and appears to think it can treat the matter just as it was treated then. Evasion, silence and procrastination have all been tried, and in the process each year some friends of the Board have been alienated. Still the question knocks louder and more imperatively than ever for a hearing and a decision. It cannot now be stifled or evaded. But delay has now brought the Board into that state in which any decision will make trouble. If true anti-slavery ground be taken, great numbers of Presbyterians and anti-abolition Congregationalists will be cooled or alienated. If they continue the present pro-slavery policy, whole churches and Presbyteries at the West will secede from them ; *not abandoning the heathen* because the Board acts wrong, but reaching the heathen through other agencies. If some evasive course, which commits the Board to no principles, be attempted, the result will be the same.

"Again : It is not an unusual argument, used with some who object to the course pursued by the Board, 'Will you let the heathen perish because the Board are

wrong or mistaken' as if the only alternative was the support of the Board or the abandonment of the heathen. The Board should remember, in their plans, that there are now numerous other channels by which the heathen may be reached; that for the reasons already mentioned they cannot depend on any considerable increase to their regular income, and much less on any indefinite enlargement; that the churches will not frequently arouse themselves to pay off a debt; and that new questions must be met with a wise and earnest spirit, or the Board will lose ground which it can never regain."

At the meeting of the Board the ensuing September, (1849,) a special Report was presented on the *Indian Missions*. The Secretaries say, "They deemed a vote adopting their letter to the Choctaw mission, of doubtful expediency." The result to which the Committee came in their Report, and which was approved by the Board, is seen in the conclusion of the Report, which every friend of freedom must refer to with grief and mortification, which appears to have been regarded as a "finality" on the vexed subject, as follows:

"They do not deem it expedient, at present, that the correspondence with the Cherokee mission should be laid before the Board; but if the Board should call for it, they will feel obligated to present it. In not presenting this correspondence they but follow ordinary usage, seeing no reason to depart from it. As the Choctaw letter falls in with previous published correspondence, they make an exception from usage in regard to it, and present it.

"Upon one other point it may be well for the Committee to say a few words. The members of the Choctaw mission have directed their attention very particularly, during the past year, to the substitution of free labor for that of slaves. They are anxious to make a change as soon as practicable, not only to gratify a large portion of their friends and patrons, but that they may increase the economy, comfort and efficiency of their own labors. The Committee have been cordially coöperating with the mission in this matter, but they are sorry to say that they have not succeeded, as yet, in relieving these brethren according to their earnest request. The subject will continue to receive attention, however, and it is hoped and believed that, in some way, free labor will be successfully introduced at an early day. Indeed, a reduction has already been made in the number of slaves hired from year to year at the different stations; and the Committee say in conclusion that, as it seems to them, the mission are willing to do all that can properly be required in existing circumstances to place this question on the desired basis."

Thus the Board, from whom better things were expected, fell back to the ground they had occupied years previous; and there remain, although it would be said by them now as it was in 1841, "The Board can sustain no relation to slavery which implies approbation of the system, and as a Board can have no connection or sympathy with it." At that time, however, slaves were employed in the service of the mission schools, the 'owners' being paid for the labor, and their masters received without objection to the mission churches; both which practices have continued ever since, to the grief of thousands who reluctantly contribute to the treasury of the Board and to the deep regret of the increasing multitude who, for conscience' sake, contribute to the treasury of this Association.

In the *Missionary Herald* for December, 1852, under the head of "Wants of the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions," complaint is made of the difficulty of obtaining missionaries for those missions. The reason is quite apparent. The dissatisfaction at the conduct of the Board, and the odium that has ensued, deter them. While pious and devoted men and women offer themselves to the *American Missionary Association* for Africa, the Ojibue mission, and other parts of the world, the old Board finds it difficult to obtain missionaries for the Indians. How greatly should we rejoice if this fact should lead the influential members of the Board to such serious

reflection that it would result in a resumption of the noble ground taken in 1848! But we refer our readers to an excellent article, respecting the important disclosure above mentioned, on another page.

In our paper we have, from the beginning, endeavored to be faithful in our expostulations and warnings. We have stated that *the labors of the missionaries for the Indians are at the expense of the slave*; that the outraged rights of the slave are not brought into consideration by either the missionaries or the Board; that only a *partial* gospel is preached to the Indians, while discipline of church members for holding their fellow church members in slavery, and buying or selling them, is wholly neglected; that the poor Indians are virtually taught to believe that slaveholding is allowed and approved of God; that it would be more in accordance with the Scripture and the example of the apostles for the Board to send to the mission ministers who will carry out the views of anti-slavery Christians, even if it should be at the expense of some division there, and cause the withdrawal of a few of the missionaries; that the steady refusal of the Board to terminate slaveholding and slave-hiring, in the mission churches and mission schools, has exerted a most disastrous influence by sheltering and shielding slaveholding in this country, and by discouraging and depressing effectual opposition to it, and efforts for its removal; and that, in the language of the *Independent*, such a people as compose the churches in the free States, "cannot long consent to aid in propagating Christianity by the ministry of missionaries whose views of Christianity compel them to be 'neutral' in regard to the bearings of Christianity on the institution of slavery. . . . They have no heart for the permanent support of missionaries that cannot, or dare not, show to converts in a slaveholding country the injustice and the entire anti-christian character of the institution of slavery."

The power of the Board to terminate slavery in the mission churches, is evident enough. The Secretaries say, in their Report of September, 1848: "While it (the Board) cannot depose a missionary from the ministry, nor silence him as a preacher, nor cut him off from the Church, it can dissolve what it formed, namely, his connection with itself and with the mission." If the connection is dissolved, the church is no longer a *mission* church. The Board has also a right to require the missionaries to teach the Indians the sinfulness of slaveholding—to use direct influences to abolish slaveholding in the churches; and it is the duty of missionaries to obey. In the same Report, it is said: "But when evils exist in the mission churches, the Prudential Committee may and must inquire whether the *missionaries* are performing their duty. . . . The Board is responsible *directly*, in the manner which has been described, for *the teaching of the missionaries*. . . . They (the missionaries) should use a direct influence, at their discretion, to eradicate the evil of slavery, as well as all other evils, from the churches under their care." And when it is considered how few slaveholders there are in the mission churches, the feasibility of purging these churches of "men-stealers" is sufficiently clear. In Mr. Treat's Report he stated, that in the Cherokee churches, consisting of 237 members, there were only 24 slaveholders; and in the Choctaw churches, consisting of 872 members, there were only 88 slaveholders. The principles of the gospel, faithfully taught and applied, with wholesome gospel discipline, it is believed, would soon bring the slaveholding members to see their guilt, and liberate their slaves, or deliver the churches from the disgrace and guilt of countenancing such offenders within their sacred inclosures.

Are we then to be denounced as enemies of the American Board, because we tell them the truth! Will any judicious person say we are wrong in pointing out the delinquencies of another missionary society, in compliance with urgent requests from

inquirers, and in reply to assertions that the Board is wholly free from all connivance at slaveholding? Will any enlightened person repeat what has been said by some well-meaning but partial persons, that notwithstanding our Association sustains so many foreign missionaries, we are the enemies of foreign missions? We trust not. Opposing error is not opposing missions. As an anti-slavery Missionary Association, founded to supply the deficiencies of other missionary societies, and to sustain missions on more correct principles, we are bound to state on suitable occasions the necessity of separate action. That necessity, which existed at the formation of this Association, still exists; for although, in consequence of an improved public sentiment, brought about by the instrumentality of anti-slavery discussion and remonstrance, the Board had adopted better principles and measures in some respects, it fell back, under the pressure of a pro-slavery sentiment, from the high ground it was at one time taking, and adopted such a course of policy, in other respects, that an association like ours continues to be necessary to meet the demands of the Christian public. We regret to say, that we have no expectation that it will cease to be necessary, even when a more enlightened and Christian public sentiment shall have effected a total change in the policy of the Board with regard to slavery, because the principles of our Association, in other respects, differ so materially from those of the Board. While the Board, venerable for years, and endeared to so many Christians for the invaluable services it has performed, in spite of the evil alluded to, and others suggested, attracts the admiration and liberal offerings of the mass of Christian professors, be it our humble aim to conduct the missionary enterprise intrusted to us by the Great Head of the Church, without unnecessarily or injuriously interfering with other missionary associations, on Christian democratic principles, not tolerating for a moment a spirit of caste, the practice of polygamy, or adopting, in lieu of a bold and direct denunciation of sin, a "mining and sapping" policy, but sending forth missionaries who will fearlessly and faithfully preach a gospel of FREEDOM, EQUALITY, PEACE, TEMPERANCE and PURITY, according to the wisdom vouchsafed, in a way to insure the confidence and liberal aid of all who prize our distinctive principles, and recognize in our proceedings the spirit of Christ. *

From the *New-England Religious Herald*.

A SIGNIFICANT FACT.

WE find in the *Missionary Herald* for December, under the head of "Wants of the Cherokee and Choctaw Missions," the following statement:

"It gives the Prudential Committee much pain to say, that the ordained laborers, so urgently needed for these two missions, have not been obtained. Five or six preachers of the gospel should be sent forth to join the brethren in the Indian territory without delay; but the Committee know not where to find them. They would ask once more, if some one will not volunteer for this service?"

A word of explanation will explain to the reader why we term this a significant fact. Perhaps it will intimate to some a low state of piety in the churches or among the candidates for the ministry, and we heard a missionary from the Choctaw mission suggest this idea in this very connection at a recent missionary meeting. But we are persuaded that this is a mistake, and that the deficiency alluded to may be explained on a very different supposition, and one which may well startle the bigoted conservatives who would perpetuate an evil policy in those missions.

We premise that the Cherokee and Choctaw missions are more favorably circumstanced for obtaining missionaries than almost any others under the care of the Board. They are old missions, the preparatory work is all done, the people are measurably civilized and Christianized, common schools exist, churches are gathered, church members are numerous, the Bible is translated into the language, books are printed in it, there has been encouraging success, and the location is in the United States. Besides, these have been rather pet missions for several years; at least it has seemed to us that unusual prominence has been given through the press and at missionary meetings to the tidings and men from that quarter, as though the Board were determined that the Christian public should believe that God especially endorsed and blessed those missions, and thus sanctioned the policy pursued in them.

Why then is such difficulty experienced in obtaining missionaries? Why do young men offer themselves to go to the ends of the world, to far more distant, inconvenient, trying and perilous missions, while none volunteer for that quarter? Why do returned missionaries from the Cherokees and Choctaws traverse the land, visit the churches, theological seminaries, and ecclesiastical bodies, make moving appeals, and then go back to their field without having found a single helper? It will not answer to denounce the churches and ministry as worldly, and therefore unwilling to encounter self-denial; for men offer themselves to go on missions in far more distant and barbarous lands. Some other stumbling-block is in the way. Some objection exists which prevents the otherwise most attractive missions from finding favor with candidates for the missionary life. What is it?

We answer, it is the pro-slavery policy pursued in the Cherokee and Choctaw missions. These are the missions of which anti-slavery men have complained, because slaveholders were freely admitted to the churches, so that OWNERS and OWNED sat together in God's house and at Christ's table! We have protested against this enormity, this virtual and practical sanction of the slave system. We have urged that the missionaries should be directed to assume a bold and decided anti-slavery position, prudently but firmly insisting that slaveholding is sinful and must be renounced before admission to the church. But the Board have refused to hear us, and the missionaries have declared their determination to adhere to their old policy. It seemed as though power was on the side of the oppressor even in the proclamation of the gospel. But now a fact appears which proves that votes of the Board and decrees of missionaries cannot slay a living Christian principle, and that ere long, if money does not cease to flow into the treasury, men will be found lacking to carry out the views of the Board. Those who go on missions are *young men*, and need we tell the Board and the churches that the young men are anti-slavery in their sympathies, and increasingly so? As certainly as the world continues to revolve, will the policy of the Board be reversed as soon as a few of the old men have died off, and a new generation succeeds to place and power. We are not prophesying so much as pointing to causes which already exist, and the operation of which any one may observe. The Prudential Committee may issue appeals, and the returned missionaries from among the Cherokees and Choctaws may wonder at the apathy of the churches and the worldliness of the ministry, but it will be more and more difficult to obtain men to go to those missions. The students in our theological seminaries have *too much* religion to go and preach an emasculated gospel; to offer in effect justification without sanctification; to proclaim the atonement and omit the decalogue; to say, "Believe," but neglect to say, "Be just and honest;" to present Christ as a Priest, but not as a King. They will not consent to join a mission where the understood policy is to be nearly or quite silent respecting one of the most glaring sins of the community; and if the vote or practice of the mission or the laws of the Indian nation require such silence as a condition of residence and labor, they will be conscientious and prudent enough to stay away. Ministers are not bound to go where their message will not be heard. Christ said, "Into whatsoever city ye enter and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same and say, Even the very dust of your city which cleaveth on us we do wipe off against you." When the Jews resisted Paul, he turned to the Gentiles. The world is wide and laborers are needed in every land, so that young men may properly choose to go elsewhere, if the Cherokees and Choctaws are unwilling to hear an anti-slavery gospel. Instead of reproaching the young ministers, we honor their piety for refusing to go in that direction, and hope that they will persevere unani-

mously in that decision, till the policy of the Board is radically changed. God's cause will not suffer in the end. The effect will be to open the eyes of the Board and of the old missionaries, and in the mean time there are numerous other missions of the Board and of the Am. Missionary Association, which need to be strengthened by accessions of all the young men who will offer. Blessed be God, that the young men of the church and ministry are so generally right on the great question of reform. We do not think that they are personally better men than their fathers, on that account, but we count them more fortunate men, as being used by God to advance the churches to higher moral and Christian ground.

From the Annual Discourse preached before the American Missionary Association, by Rev. JAMES B. WALKER.

The text was 1 John iv. 20: "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

The preacher said, "After brief preliminary remarks, I shall endeavor to develop and illustrate the principles contained in this passage, and then apply them, as tests of character and duty in the missionary work." He said, "Assent to the character of God and the obligation of the Divine law, in the abstract, is a different thing from faith in God and in his law revealed in their relations to us." And further, "*He that does not love man does not love God.*" John says to professed believers, in the text, "If any man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar." After setting forth the principles declared in the text, the preacher proceeded to show "what fruits true love to Christ will develop in the lives of believers."

"The motive power in all true gospel effort is love to Jesus;" and the following are some of its scriptural and unfailing characteristics: 1. "Love to Christ produces labor to make others like Christ." 2. "It leads those who possess it to oppose *every thing which injures man.*" 3. "Love to man, as exhibited in Christ, leads Christians to labor first and most for those who most need sympathy and effort."

The preacher proceeded to apply the specific truth of the passage to missionary organizations, and to the duty of promoting free missions in particular, as follows:

It may be said truly that these principles apply equally to all Christian effort, and to all benevolent enterprises; and in this connection we are asked, why then do we not expend our efforts through the older missionary organizations, instead of forming new ones to labor for the accomplishment of the same ends? The question is apposite, and I shall endeavor to answer.

It is incumbent upon us to give reasons for our efforts to some who inquire. Many feel, as we think all should, that it is not only the privilege but the duty of all Christian people to send their money through any organization they may choose; and that they should examine and send their aid through that society which is established upon principles most in accordance with the gospel. The older societies being in existence, the formation of others does imply that many Christian people think their principles are in some respects defective, or new ones would not be established. With me this is true; and it is due to every one who has any interest in the missionary work, that an answer should be given why we deem it the duty of Christians, while they hear and respect other missionary organizations, to contribute their funds through free missionary societies.

The reasons for the free missionary organization lie in the principle and action of older Boards.

The American Board receives slaveholders into mission churches. They propagate a Christianity which, in the eyes of all men who know their principles, recognizes slaveholding as consistent with the gospel of Jesus Christ. They send missionaries to the Indians. They find there two classes of heathen, the red man and the black; often about the same in color, and always of about equal intelligence. Now what do the missionaries of the Board do in such circumstances? They recognize those as Christians who enslave others, contrary to all the principles of justice and mercy.

The Christianity they establish among the Indians leads them to believe that slavery is in accordance with the principles of the gospel of Christ. The missionaries make the standard by which the Indian who accepts it must judge of the character of Christ, and of their duties to men. The light of nature would teach the Indian that slavery was wrong, while the missionaries by taking it into the church teach them that it is right. This reception of slavery into the mission churches not only corrupts the conscience of the Indians, but it corrupts the conscience of Christians at home. Those who continue to support the old Boards must apologize for or defend the connection of slavery with their missions. If Christians will apologize for slavery in connection with the Church, they will learn to do so in connection with the State. Their conscience will be defiled in regard to the corrupting influences of slavery every where.

Thus it seems to me there can be no doubt about the fact that the missions of the American Board are dishonoring the gospel, and propagating, by the money of the benevolent, a slaveholding Christianity among the Indians. At the same time, they are corrupting the Church at home.

It is due to this influential Society to say that they will not propagate slavery with the gospel in other nations except our own country. In Africa they will not receive a black slaveholder until he emancipates his slaves. This very fact shows that they recognize their principles as wrong, and that the slave power in this country has either intimidated or corrupted them. All further action on the subject, and even all further discussion, is discountenanced and resisted. They publish their approval of the Indian missions as they are, and have rigidly enforced a finality of discussion and action in all meetings of the Board, and speak of their meetings as peaceful and spiritual when this enormous evil in which they are involved is not referred to.

It is sometimes said, by good people who have not attended to the history of this evil as it has strengthened and confirmed itself in the American Board, that the Board will in the end cease to propagate a slaveholding gospel. Such persons do not remember that both the Board and their missionaries have reached a finality upon this subject. Sin does not exhaust itself, but strengthens itself wherever it is tolerated. If the gospel which missionary boards proclaim tolerates it, *what can condemn or remove it?*

The missionaries where slavery is sanctified by baptizing it into the churches say, "Nor can we ever make it a test of piety or a condition of admission to the privileges of the church, that a candidate should express a determination not to live and die a slaveholder."

In relation to buying and selling their fellow-beings, and even in relation to the crime of selling children from their parents, the missionaries of the Board do not consider such crimes, if they should occur, as disciplinable offenses. They say, "in relation to the separation of parents and children, we must first remark that it is one of those things which are not forbidden by express injunction of the Scriptures. It is impossible in our circumstances to make it a general rule, that the separation of parents and children by sale and purchase shall be regarded as a disciplinable offense."

First they say it is one of those things which are not forbidden by express injunction of the Scriptures. How dreadful this is! It is one of the ten commandments: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, nor thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's." Yet these missionaries teach that a man may not only covet, but take and sell his neighbor's wife and child, and they know no injunction of the Bible against it. Merciful God! what evil sin, cherished, will work in churches and mission boards, and even in the minds of missionaries themselves! Letters have been subsequently drawn from them that mitigate the enormity of this abuse, but nothing that changes their position.

The missionaries say likewise that their doctrine and practice have reached a finality with them as well as with the Board. They write, "We earnestly hope that what we have written may be taken as a final exposition of our sentiments—a defining of our position." They say again, "It may be deemed our duty by some to adopt a train of measures that shall aim in their object directly to countervail the whole system, and in the end undermine the entire fabric which human legisla-

tion has framed in regard to slavery. *We do not feel that we are required to adopt any such course, nor do we regard this as our work.*"

Such are the principles upon which the missionary work is conducted by the American Board among the Indians, and by the Home Missionary Board in slave States. We do not hesitate to say that such principles, instead of being the principles of the gospel of Christ, are in direct conflict both with the nature and design of the gospel. We say this here to vindicate ourselves, and to remonstrate with our brethren.

A free missionary society, both for home and foreign missions, is now formed upon what we believe to be gospel principles. That it is right to propagate the gospel without slavery we think none can doubt. That it is right to propagate it with slavery some believe. Each Christian has the opportunity to maintain whichever of the two principles his heart and conscience approve. We state the case as we believe Christ would have us do, and leave the results with God, and the responsibilities with each individual Christian.

ALBANY CONGREGATIONAL CONVENTION.


The following resolution was finally unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this Convention, it is the tendency of the gospel, wherever it is preached in its purity, to correct all social evils and to destroy SIN in all its forms; and that it is the duty of Missionary Societies to grant aid to churches in slaveholding States, in the support of such ministers ONLY as shall so preach the gospel, and inculcate the principles and application of gospel principles, that, with the blessing of God, it shall have its FULL EFFECT in awakening and enlightening the moral sense in regard to slavery, and in bringing to pass the SPEEDY ABOLITION of that STUPENDOUS WRONG; and that wherever a minister is not permitted so to preach, he should, in accordance with the directions of Christ in such cases, 'depart out of that city.'"

Rev. Mr. Holbrook, of Iowa, the next day, said: "There is a deep feeling in the Western churches on the subject of slavery; and I rejoice to say that the position taken last evening is precisely the position which I have advocated in our General Association, and in the newspapers; and I believe it is a decision which will commend itself heartily to all our churches in the West, and that the influence of it will be to strengthen the influence of the H. M. Society beyond all calculation."

Rev. J. B. Walker said he desired, for himself and others, to suggest a single modification or amendment in one passage of the remarks which had just been made. He supposed it was implied in the remarks, but he wished it to be distinctly stated. He agreed to all things that had been said concerning the valuable results which would follow the doings of this Convention. But in regard to the statement that the action of this Convention would have the effect to prevent many churches from withdrawing from the American Home Missionary Society, it should be added—*provided* that Society shall think proper to act upon the principles set forth in the report of this Convention. This Convention is not the A. H. M. Society, and our report does not speak for it. If that Society shall continue to send out missionaries who receive and retain members in their communion, who hold and treat men as property; if they sustain men in slaveholding States, who preach the gospel so that it will not have an effect to bring to pass the "speedy abolition of the tremendous wrong of slavery;" if these principles of the report are not carried out by the old Boards, many churches already disaffected, both at the West and the East, will give their contributions to other Societies, and many not now disaffected will become so.

Rev. J. Blanchard, of Illinois, said he wished likewise to acquiesce in the things spoken by Mr. Holbrook in behalf of the West, with the addition or suggestion just stated by Mr. Walker.

 The AMERICAN HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY sustains 51 ministers in slaveholding States, over churches many of which are composed, in part, of slaveholders; and has not, since the passage of the resolution, given any indication of the course it intends hereafter to pursue on the subject.

ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

OCTOBER, 1852.

RECOIL OF WAR UPON POLITICIANS.

The cause of Peace, common to all good men, intermeddles with no struggles or schemes of individuals or parties for office and power; but it must, if true to its high purpose, seize on passing as well as on past events to instil into the community lessons of warning and wisdom. One of these is the suicidal folly of civilians abetting war, or a fondness for it, among the people. The latter are the chief sufferers from war, while politicians, as its real authors and abettors, expect from it popularity, emolument and power. More or less of these they must of course gain during its progress; but it is marvellous that they have not learned how it ultimately recoils on themselves, and snatches its highest prizes from their grasp. War takes the lion's share of its political as well as its other spoils. It is a brutal tyrant; and statesmen of the ripest experience, and loftiest abilities, "it throws into the shade, or chains to its car, or crushes beneath its iron hoof. If you cultivate the arts of peace, then will talent, knowledge and wisdom hold the reins of government; but let the people become warlike, and military chieftains will soon drive them all at the point of the bayonet. Review the history of Greece and Rome, of England under Cromwell, of France under Napoleon, of all the republics except our own in the New World; and you will find on this point a superabundance of proof. It is amazing that intellectual men should eulogize warriors, and still more strange the encouragement which statesmen lend to war; for they are thus cherishing a serpent that will one day wreath his folds around themselves, and strangle them to death. It is only in peace that their worth can be fully appreciated, or their merits duly rewarded; while in war, or under its influence even in peace, Pompey outpeers Cicero, Cromwell takes precedence of Milton, and the hero of New Orleans or Tippecanoe, with only a modicum of talent or knowledge, leaves the first minds of the land far behind them in the race of popularity and power."

Our own history is full of warnings on this point. "When politicians bring on war," says a neutral in politics, "they must pay the penalty. In republics, if civilians wish to retain their just influence as statesmen, they must preserve peace. War always has given, and always will give, in our own and in every free country, ascendancy to military reputation. Snatching the prizes of political ambition from the politician, it will carry the successful General to his seats of power. In 1848, some of the politicians who pushed this country into the war of 1812, still live to brood over the fact, that the war raised up military chieftains who clutched from their grasp the Presidential crown, which otherwise would have encircled their brows in

sure succession. It is a most instructive circumstance in our history, that when James Madison, then at the head of the government, manifested a reluctance to favor a declaration of war with England, a committee of three was despatched from a republican caucus to communicate to him the determination of that party to insist upon the measure. The experienced wisdom of that great statesman was overruled, and constrained by the short-sighted zeal of less wary politicians. Of that caucus Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun were the master spirits, and of that committee they were members. Although quite young men, they had, by their genius and eloquence, even then acquired the greatest degree of popularity that can be attained in the sphere of statesmanship. The whole nation was waiting, with admiring eagerness, to confer upon them, one after the other, its highest honor. They had their way, and war was declared. When the revolutionary series of Presidents was brought to a close, on the retirement of James Munroe, Gen. Jackson, the hero of New Orleans, took from Mr. Clay so many of the electoral votes of the West, and from Mr. Calhoun so many of the votes of the South and Middle States, as to leave them both distanced in the race. The popularity of Jackson yielded only to that of Gen. Harrison, the hero of Tippecanoe; and a fresh crop of military chieftains has just been reared to destroy, in all probability, the last chance of these veteran aspirants for the great prize. It is not the least of the eminent services they have rendered their country, that in their baffled ambition, the distinguished statesmen and truly great men whom we have named, teach to all coming times the salutary lesson, that, if politicians will have war, they must step aside for ever from the path of honor, and relinquish the posts of power to overshadowing rivals created by their own suicidal hands. It is not unlikely, as just intimated, that the lesson will be corroborated by the political results of the war in which the country is now involved. Let us hope that it may make a deep and durable impression upon that class of persons whom it so vitally concerns. When the leaders of parties become convinced, that in promoting warlike measures and a military spirit, they are digging their own graves, we confidently rely upon perpetual peace." (1)

This prediction is now fulfilled. The war did actually dig the political grave of its authors and chief abettors. The very President who began it, was denied the compliment even of a solitary vote for his re-nomination; the body-guard of his supporters were nearly all dropped from public service, and the whole party overwhelmed with a defeat that has no parallel in our history. A most salutary warning to politicians; and every true patriot must earnestly desire that it may be duly heeded in future.

But this is not all. The Mexican war drifted back upon us a shoal of candidates for all sorts of office. Before its close, nearly every one of its prominent generals was nominated by somebody even for the presidency itself; (2) not a few of them, like Generals Kearney and Shields, were soon after appointed to high civil offices; (3) a multitude of them, especially

(1) North Am. Rev. for April, 1848, No. LXVI., pp. 315-6.

(2) The shameful quarrels among the generals, even in the city of Mexico, occasioning so many and so protracted courts-martial, both there and at home, arose mainly from competitions, and jealousies, and heart-burnings about the great prize of the republic, the presidency. Everybody remembers that the papers teemed month after month with these disgraceful revelations, all the legitimate brood of war in a republic.

(3) The editor of the Boston Atlas, writing from Washington in the winter of 1817-8, speaks "of the great number of young men who are in Washington at this time, who have served as Lieutenants, Captains, &c., in the Mexican war. They are to be seen in the hotels, and are easily distinguished from the common horde of office-seekers and dilettanti, who swarm

at the West and South-west, have been selected for seats in Congress, and their respective State Legislatures; and, to cap the climax, a man, little known to the country a single year before that war, and never dreamed of for any service beyond the army, had no sooner fought the battle of Palo Alto, though a mere skirmish hardly worth a passing paragraph in the history of such a warrior as Napoleon, that the popular war-spirit, even in advance of all party calculation, proclaimed him at once as "the *people's* candidate for the presidency." We are not now sitting in judgment on the man himself; we are only observing how he rose to power. Nobody could blame him for this sudden outburst of popularity, nor have we the slightest wish to disparage him or his friends; we merely say that war alone made him President of these United States. Doubtless, his subsequent reputation for talent, integrity, independence, and other estimable qualities, may have won votes for him; but, beyond a doubt, it was solely his popularity as a general, though acquired in a war odious to the mass of his own supporters, that procured his *nomination* for the high office he ultimately reached. Thus the mere warrior again eclipsed all the great political luminaries of the republic, and threw into practical contempt its great statesmen who had grown grey in its service as civilians, and shed over it the undying lustre of their genius, eloquence and wisdom.

It is painful to dwell on such facts; but we cannot quit this theme without alluding, in the very strong language of another, to the continued influence of the Mexican war in selecting candidates for the presidency: "From another point of the compass a similar moral may be drawn for future presidential aspirants. Neither the Democratic party, nor its Northern leaders, had anything to gain by the Mexican war; and yet they plunged headlong into it at the dictation of the South. The Whig party, as such, always pronounced the war itself to be an aggression, and its territorial acquisitions a robbery. Yet the great body of this party voted the supplies that ratified its inception. Opposition to the war of 1812 had proved politically disastrous to many of those who made it; and it was foreseen that opposition to the Mexican war might be attended with similar results. Hence the lukewarmness of Whig opposition in Congress, and hence the voting of supplies to carry it on. Hence the pro-slavery men, and the 'manifest destiny' men, were allowed to have their way; and so the war was continued at an estimated expenditure in the whole of more than \$200,000,000, and the ultimate acquisition of territory, some portion of which is already occupied by slaves, and two-thirds of which is laid open to slavery by law.

And now, what has been the effect of that war upon both the Democratic

here during the sessions of Congress, by the magnitude and grimness of their mustachios, imperials, and hair in general. Having seen 'the elephant' abroad in the wars, they rush here to head-quarters to tell their stories of hair-breadth 'scapes, and solicit appointments and promotion. From a scene of beastly intoxication, in which one of these young heroes took the chief part, which I witnessed to-day, I fear that their camp life has not improved their morals, or their capacity for useful labor. To a reflective mind, the moral debasement incident to all war, is one of its chief evils. No one can remain long at Washington without noticing the great number of young men who, from having taken part in the victories in Mexico, have returned home unfitted for any profitable labor in the peaceful walks of life. If this war continues much longer, a sufficient number of characters of this class may be thrown upon the country materially to embarrass the action of Congress, and so influence the masses, that the war policy will become the settled policy of the nation; and those of our public men who have the nerve and ability to attempt to stem the war current, will be overthrown, and trampled under foot by the iron-heeled champions of perpetual war!"

and Whig civilians, who either vigorously sustained it, or opposed to it only a feeble resistance? It made the Cæsars who have come back to rule over Rome. But for the Mexican war, General Taylor would have remained a 'frontier colonel,' as Mr. Webster sneeringly called him, and not even lunacy would have conceived of him for President. But for the Mexican war, General Scott, though in honor and in bravery retaining his invincibility, would have lacked, to political wooers, the more potent charm of availability, and would never have been nominated. And but for the Mexican war, the shades of oblivion would soon have perfected their easy work of hiding the name of General Pierce from the world forever. And now, behold the civilians, Cass, Buchanan, Marcy, and the rest, who stood sponsors and god-fathers for that bloody deed! Defeated in 1848 by the very man whom the war they supported, had raised up! General Taylor discomfited only one Santa Anna in Mexico, but half a dozen at home. Look, too, at Mr. Webster, whose giant blows, had they been struck at the fitting time, might have broken the helmet and pierced the mailed armor of that Mars; yet see him thrust aside in 1848, to make room for one hero born of that war, and in 1852 hardly allowed to enter his name as a competitor against another. In 1852, see, also, General Pierce, who had about as much to do with the Mexican victories as little Iulus had to do with the Trojan war, yet plucking the nomination from Cass, Buchanan, Marcy, Douglass, and all the rest. The camp triumphs over cabinet and Senate. The *cedant arma togæ* is read backwards. How many of these warriors will remain in 1856 and in 1860, to shoulder aside the civilians for the third and fourth time, because they were false to their duty in waging or in tolerating that war, remains to be seen. But what a righteous retribution for those civilians who, at first, might have prevented, or afterwards might have stayed, that effusion of human blood! As a specimen of poetic justice, romance or drama has nothing finer."

HONORS TO MILITARY MEN.

At a military dinner given to Sir HARRY SMITH, some three years ago in London, he remarked: "it must be confessed, gentlemen, ours is a DAMNABLE PROFESSION." This same Sir HARRY SMITH was commander-in-chief of the British forces in the Caffre war in South Africa, and in that capacity has done a great deal to illustrate the truth of his own declaration. Whatever may be said in justification of a strictly defensive war, the *profession* of arms is both damnable and infamous. The professional soldier follows war as a trade. He contracts with the government under which he serves, to prosecute *any* war which that government may declare, whether defensive or aggressive, to the best of his ability. He cannot reason and decide whether the war is just or unjust; his sole business is, to obey orders. If he conclude that those orders in any case bind him to commit crime, he has no alternative but to execute them, or resign his commission at the sacrifice of his military reputation. The professional soldier, therefore, whether he be officer or private, is simply a hired assassin. This is strictly and literally the truth. He engages to kill openly or secretly, (for in war a midnight attack upon a sleeping enemy is considered honorable,) whomsoever his government may designate, whether man, woman, or child. For this he is paid a stipulated sum, which is his salary, and means of living. All his military education is intended and adapted to qualify him to kill with skill, neatness and despatch; and he is honored in exact proportion to the number of enemies he has slaughtered.

Now, every life sacrificed by the aggressors in an unjust war, is simply a murder. Admit the rightfulness of a strictly defensive war, and still those who provoke the quarrel can be regarded in no other light than as wholesale murderers. But the contract of the soldier with his government binds him to wage whatever war that government may declare, whether of defence or aggression, and thus perpetrate wholesale butchery of human beings for hire.

If war is ever justifiable, it is only as the last resort in defence of rights more precious than life itself. This every civilized man admits. Even then it is a fearful and mournful alternative. The heart possessed of the commonest feelings of humanity, shrinks from the terrible ordeal of battle, and will take arms, if at all, only from a stern and resistless sense of duty, from a discharge of which there is no possible escape. Such a man—and if war in this extreme case be right, no other kind of man is fit to wage it—will embrace the very first opportunity to lay down his arms, and return joyfully to the more congenial and happy pursuits of peace.

It is a disputed and doubtful point, whether bloodshed, even in this extreme case, is justifiable; but it is not doubtful or disputed, that under any other circumstances war is stupendously wicked. Now, it is evident from the nature of the case, that none of this reluctance to enter upon the bloody work of human slaughter, can be felt by the professional soldier. He chooses war for a trade, in preference to all other callings in life, and bargains to kill with alacrity, and for reward, whenever ordered. Thus the first choice of his vocation indicates either outright blood-thirstiness, or a reckless indifference to the sacredness of human life; and all his subsequent training in the camp, and on the battle-field, tends to foster and strengthen both these dispositions of mind. In view of this inevitable tendency of the military profession, it is not strange that the annals of war, between what are called by courtesy Civilized and Christianized nations, are stained with the record of the most cold-blooded and atrocious crimes, such as robbery, arson, rape, adultery and murder.

It is surely, then, a sad and disheartening indication to see a professedly Christian nation honoring men with the highest offices in its gift, solely or mainly on account of their achievements in battle. Yet such has been the practice of this nation almost from the beginning. The men who have been raised to the highest civil stations, with the greatest enthusiasm, and the largest majorities, have been men whose chief, and in some cases whose only distinction was success in the work of human slaughter. What is worse than all, Christians of this land have not only seen these things done without rebuke, but have even aided to do them!

MISCELLANEOUS.

REPLY TO A CALL FOR A FINE, OR A MILITARY DRILL.—In the State of New York, persons liable to military service are excused by paying an annual tax of only seventy-five cents. It seems, however, that some there refuse even this pittance; and in response to a demand for either this small tax, or his appearance on parade, “fully armed and equipped according to law,” one “C. O. READ,” under date of “August 1, 1852,” thus writes to the aforesaid militia officer:—

“The meaning of the above notice, reduced to plain English, I understand to be this: that I provide myself with shooting and stabbing irons, or a long butcher-knife, (as the case may be,) and assemble with others, similar-

ly equipped, and together learn the art and science of wholesale human butchery. Sir, I claim exemption from such service because it is barbarous, inhuman and wicked.

Why, sir, I would not act the part of *hangman*—even when the victim is guilty of the highest crime—much less would I join with others in the wholesale murder of innocent men, women and children. The trade of an assassin is abhorrent to my soul, whether it be in the retail or wholesale line. It is so when he selects only those he may deem deserving of death; but doubly abhorrent is it, when the individual surrenders his own will, conscience and judgment, and agrees to shoot, stab, slay, kill and destroy any and every one, as another may see fit to direct, and without regard to their guilt or innocence.

I also claim exemption on the ground, that such employment is directly opposed to the plainest principles of Christianity. "Christ says: "Love your enemies;" and "love worketh no ill to his neighbor." Now, if the government you represent commands me to kill and destroy, then it clearly commands me to do what God forbids. I am no disbeliever in human governments, within their proper limits; but, when they command me to do what God forbids, I answer them in the words of the apostle, "whether it be right to obey God or man, judge ye." To your communication, therefore, I must reply in the words of one of the early Christians: "I am a Christian, and cannot fight."

WEST POINT MILITARY ACADEMY.—It is said that it costs this nation \$800 for each cadet that is educated at this Academy. If this was all the evil, there would not be quite so much cause for complaint, and for desiring the suspension or utter overthrow of that inhuman institution. But this is but a fraction of the evil, a drop in the bucket. After men are taught to murder their fellow-beings, they want employment, and for that purpose will do all they can to get up wars with other nations, so that we may never expect permanent peace while the nation continues to manufacture murderers. Had there never been any military academy in this nation, that most wicked and disgraceful war with Mexico might never have taken place. There was in the country a swarm of men educated at West Point, who wanted a chance to work at their trade, and fill their pockets out of the national treasury, and with plunder. They had worked themselves into the favor of government officers, and by their advice the war with Mexico was encouraged.

When the eyes of mankind are opened to see clearly the real peace-promoting principles of the gospel, what a disgrace it will be to a nation like this to be found with a military school for the education of warriors! What are the people of this nation thinking about? They make a higher profession of Christianity than any other nation on the globe; they have the New Testament in all their houses, hear it read in all their churches, and yet do not even appear to have the least doubt that fighting is a part of Christianity! Nay, they nearly all pretend it is a Christian duty to slay men, and dash out the brains of innocent women and children, for the credit of the nation! Just think of it—a Christian nation educating men in the art of human slaughter, and at the same time professing to be the meek and humble disciples of the Prince of Peace! Educating murderers at eight hundred dollars each, and spending not a single dollar to teach the science of agriculture or the useful arts!

THE EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG FOR WAR.—An encampment of one hundred boys under 18 years of age, belonging in the town of Quincy, was commenced near the Stone Church in that place yesterday morning. They are divided into two companies, one from the North and the other from the

South part of the town. Their uniform consists, one company of blue jackets and white trowsers, the other of red jackets and white trowsers, and all have fatigue caps. They pitched their tents in military fashion, and placed their guards around the field. Their arms were, however, a harmless wooden imitation of the musket. In the forenoon, yesterday, the friends of each company gave them a collation. In the afternoon they were reviewed by Brigadier J. A. Veasie. To-day they go through the drill exercise in presence of their friends. The camp ground of these young volunteers has been visited by a large number of people.—*Boston Traveller*.

A fine nursery of war! Here is the way, nor could a surer one be devised, to create an early and a life-long fondness for war. It must of course have been got up with the consent and aid of parents; and then there came high officers to review them, and "large numbers" to see and applaud them. Strange infatuation for a *Christian* community!

THE ARMY SYSTEM IN RUSSIA.—The imperial family of Russia, says a recent letter-writer, resides at this season at Peterhoff; and while the annual manœuvres are going on, Nicholas spends his time with the army. These manœuvres are mock campaigns, the Empe or taking the command of one division, the Crown Prince, Alexander, of the other, and the two armies skirmish across the country, retreating, pursuing, and finally ending by the victorious party storming their opponents in their intrenched camp. In these exercises they go through all the operations of real war, assault and take castles, and, for about a fortnight, carry on their mimic strife, in which the Emperor generally contrives to come out the conqueror. An immense amount of revenue is of course consumed in supporting an army reputed to contain half a million of men, and in carrying on such extensive manœuvres as these; and there is, also, some danger of the strife becoming serious, as this did occur on one occasion when two favorite regiments, fighting against each other, became so excited that their sport turned to earnest, and about thirty men were bayoneted before they could be stopped. The army is the Czar's hobby; he performs his other arduous duties as ruler of such an immense empire with energy and industry; but to military affairs he turns for relaxation. With the soldiers he is popular; but his strict discipline and severe restrictions procure for him more fear than love from his officers. He is now recruiting largely to add to the already overgrown army, and various rumors are afloat as to what he intends to do with it. The prevalent supposition is that he is watching his chance to suppress free principles in Europe; but his son is different in character, and before he can realize his gigantic projects, old age or death will probably frustrate them.

It is curious to observe how, in this country, everything centres in the Czar. He is the great idol to which all bow in fear or admiration; his movements, his actions, form the common topic of conversation; and every one has a stock of anecdotes to relate illustrating either his good or his bad qualities, as they may happen to like or dislike him.

THE PRUSSIAN MILITARY SYSTEM.—The Prussians are most essentially a military people. At twenty years of age every Prussian, whatever be his condition, must join the army, and serve for three years. The usual exceptions of physical inability, and being the only son of a widow, of course prevail, and there are certain others; but exclusive of these, it is by no means always convenient for a young man to leave his home in order to "serve his king," especially when his country is enjoying full peace and prosperity. Neither is there any temptation as to pay, which, for a private soldier,

besides his uniform, amounts to one and a half pounds of bread per day, a dinner costing three cents, and three cents in money. Even when a man has served his three years, he does not quit all connection with the army; for he is for two years longer one of the "reserve," and, should war break out, must immediately join his regiment, and take the field.

The Landwehr is composed of those who have passed through both the regular service and the reserve; that is, those between twenty-five and forty years, at which latter age they are no longer called upon. This body is regularly organized into regiments, &c., but has no drill or parades except two terms of a month each for encampment and exercise by way of review. It differs then greatly from the American militia, in being composed of well disciplined and thoroughly instructed men.

If a young man at twenty desires for any reason to be respited, he may be for four years; but at the end of that time he must join the army as a "volunteer;" that is, he must uniform and maintain himself for a year, receiving nothing from the State. In time of peace, the regular army, consisting of more than one hundred thousand men, garrison the towns and fortresses, but in the occurrence of war it immediately takes the field reinforced by its reserved men, making each infantry regiment three thousand strong. The first division of Landwehrs (men between twenty-five and thirty-two) are then mustered into service, uniformed from the arsenals, and garrison the towns, recruiting the army, and being itself recruited from the second division of Landwehr, as occasion and the exigencies of the war require. The officers are regularly educated at the military academies, of which there are three provincial, and one central institution at Berlin, numbering in all nine hundred cadets.

SOME EVILS, ESPECIALLY OF A NAVAL WAR, TO OURSELVES.—As soon as a war shall occur between the United States and any naval power, our possessions in the Pacific will be an easy conquest. San Francisco will be the immediate object of attack. Under such circumstances, it will be natural for California to make a separate peace with foreign powers. In other words, she must, from interest, separate herself from our quarrels with foreign powers; for we contribute nothing to her defence, although we might involve her in destruction. The moment a war occurs, all communication between the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast will be cut off. We have but one route now, the Panama route, which is open and available for transporting troops and supplies to California, and that will be, of course, closed to us in time of war with a naval power.

PROGRESS OF PEACE SENTIMENTS.

We see on every side proofs of such progress; and the recent breeze about the fisheries is calling them forth even in England as well as in our own country. It is too true that some members of our Congress, a few even of grave Senators, betrayed in their hot and hasty utterances, a bad spirit on this subject, as well as a disreputable lack of wisdom and dignity; and there are always low and partizan editors enough among us to echo and re-echo every war sentiment they can catch from any quarter; but the mass of the people, so far from responding to such appeals, have promptly rebuked them, and betrayed scarcely the slightest symptom of excitement about the matter.

Just so in England, where the *people* seem almost instinctively to resist all idea of war with us for the settlement of such controversies. We give a

few illustrations. A correspondent of the N. Y. Christian Advocate and Journal, says :—

We have been a little excited by the excitement on your side of the water about the fish. Certainly there has been no anger here, unless at our government, for not having managed to keep out of difficulties on such a point. But as to settling things of that kind between you and us by blows, John Bull seems, thank Providence, most perfectly cured of all such desires. He would fight if you force him, and in that case *would* fight ; but *the whole public mind of the country is averse to every thought of war with the States.* I am delighted to see *how this peace feeling prevails among men of all parties.* And surely it is much more reasonable to settle differences before bloodshed than after it. If we had fought and beaten you, or got beaten by you, what would the matter gain in clearness by that ? But each of these commotions does good in this way, that it accustoms nations to settle their disputes without war. May a gracious Providence order it that this may ever be the case between us and you !

One of the editors of the Independent, now travelling abroad, writes thus from Ireland :—

Every body here as well as in England and Scotland, rejoices at the settlement of the fishing question. No one with whom I have come into contact, whether in public conveyances, at hotels, or in the social circle, has been disposed to pick a quarrel with the United States, or to condemn our government and people. On the contrary, the ministry here is universally blamed and condemned for its rash and discourteous proceeding in this affair. A witty Irish gentleman remarked the other day, that the settlement of the question reminded him of the Irishman who, finding that he couldn't live peaceably with his wife, proposed that they should divide the house ; to this she agreed ; so says he, " Biddy, ye'll be jist afther taking the outside of the house, and I'll kape the inside." He thought the Americans kept the inside. Yet nobody seems troubled by this. America is respected and loved by the people of Great Britain and Ireland.

THE CODLING CONTROVERSY.—The tone of the English liberal press towards the Tory ministry, for their late onslaught against the American fishermen, is unsparingly severe. Take the following sample, being the introductory paragraph of a leading article in *Boyd's Weekly Newspaper*, edited by Douglas Jerrold :

"**FISH KETTLE WAR?**—Certainly not. The fish-kettle may make a noise ; may throb as with hot bubbling water ; much steam may escape, but there will be no boiling over.

"Mr. Disraeli is a man of dangerous eloquence : Lord Derby is a nobleman of great legendary chivalry : Lord Malmesbury a foreign secretary who unwittingly may be induced to put his hand to any thing. Nevertheless Disraeli would as soon think of persuading Derby to place his head against the muzzle of a loaded Tower gun ; and that done, would as soon blandly urge the complying Malmesbury to fire the gun, blowing into some future England that self-sacrificing head of the Cabinet—we say Mr. Disraeli, Earls Derby and Malmesbury, would all of them as soon contrive to act this tragic folly—the remainder of the ministry generally assenting and kindly assisting—as think of embroiling England and America in a cod and mackerel contest—in a stupid, unprofitable, fish-kettle war."

To all this let us add, that France is now proposing a large reduction of her army. Do we not thus see multiplying proofs of progress in this cause ?

HOME OPERATIONS.

WE have heretofore interspersed our discussions of Peace as a subject with too little of what has been done to advance it as an enterprise. There must of course be so much similarity in the plans formed from time to time by our Committee, and in the efforts made from place to place by our Secretary and Agents, that few, except its most ardent friends, would be likely to feel an unflagging interest in the frequent repetition of such details; but we certainly ought to let our readers know what is done or attempted for our cause, and how the Society's servants toil in this great Christian reform. In our last we quoted from the proposals of our Committee, and the suggestions of our Secretary, enough to show that they have all along been fully awake to what is needed in the cause, and quite ready to carve out ample work for its friends all over the country. To these appeals we hope in due time for a generous response; and meanwhile we will furnish some further specimens of our Committee's recent action, and of the way in which the Society's servants are laboring to accomplish its objects.

ACTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS.—"Voted, to appoint a *Standing Committee on Publications* in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of Reference to the Society at its late annual meeting."

The object of this measure has heretofore been accomplished, with equal or greater care, sometimes by appointing a special committee on each case as it occurred, or by bringing the question at once before the whole Executive Committee; but a Standing Committee is a decided improvement, and has been promptly adopted to supply the only deficiency, and that more apparent than real, in the past course of our Committee, as compared with the recommendations of the Committee of Reference in their able and elaborate report. Our system now conforms in every particular, we believe, to that which the Society, at its last anniversary, approved by a vote entirely unanimous.

PETITIONS TO CONGRESS.—"Resolved, That we deem it incumbent on the American Peace Society to renew this year its petition to our National Legislators in behalf of peaceful Substitutes for War.

Resolved, That we earnestly request the friends of Peace throughout the country to unite with us for this purpose, and to forward their petitions to both Houses of Congress *early* in the approaching session."

We hope and trust our friends will pay special heed to these resolves of our Committee, and take prompt and efficient measures to aid us in carrying them into effect. It would be well, indeed, if their petitions should be forwarded (for the House, to the Representative from their own district, and for the Senate, to one of the Senators from their own State, unless for special reasons some other member be preferred,) in season for the opening of Congress. The session will be so short—only three months—that whatever is done, must be done quickly. And for this service, as we have no agents to

send forth on such an errand, we must of course rely on the spontaneous co-operation of our friends. Let them take hold of the work at once, with a determination to see it done, and it *will* be done to good purpose. Let every reader of the *Advocate* consider himself *specially* charged with this labor of love for the cause in his own place; and, writing off two copies of the sub-joined form, one for the House, and the other for the Senate, let him go forth to procure signatures, and then forward them, as above suggested, to Washington, before the first of December:

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States :

The undersigned, citizens of — in the State of —, deploring the great and manifold evils of war, and believing it possible to supersede its alleged necessity, as an Arbiter of Justice among Nations, by the adoption of timely and feasible substitutes, respectfully petition your Honorable Bodies to take such action as you may deem best for this most desirable end, by “securing in our treaties with other nations, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation.”

¶ BRINGING THE QUESTION OF PEACE BEFORE STATE LEGISLATURES.—

“*Resolved*, That we invite the friends of Peace in different States of our Union to petition their respective Legislatures, at their next session, in behalf of peaceful substitutes for War, and endeavor to procure from them some action in favor of this important object.”

We have heretofore done too little in this way of promoting our cause; but our Committee deem it very desirable to enlist our State as well as National Legislators in behalf of an object so important and interesting alike to them all. Their favorable action would help us much with the general government; and, even should we fail of obtaining any decisive action, we should doubtless find the effort itself an excellent mode of bringing the general claims of our cause before the people of each State through their Legislature. We must agitate, wisely yet resolutely and perseveringly agitate, or we can never gain our object; and this we deem a proper and hopeful mode of agitation, in which we wish at once to enlist all our friends from one end of the country to the other. We hope they will promptly respond to our wishes in this respect by petitioning their respective Legislatures in such form as they may prefer; but in furtherance of the object stated in the foregoing resolution of our Committee, a modification of the form of the above-proposed petition to Congress, would perhaps suffice for the purpose.

On the general subject of “*Stipulated Arbitration* as a feasible and effective substitute for War,” a document of some length has just been prepared under the direction of our Committee, designed to bring this particular substitute before the Legislators of our country as a measure peculiarly American, and worthy of their special consideration. It will be stereotyped forthwith, and be ready very soon for use by our friends; and we hope they will extensively come to our aid in bringing this part of our cause before the public and the Legislature in their respective States.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH MISSIONARIES.—The first missionaries from our country to the heathen, such as Hall, Judson and Newell, took a spontaneous, active interest in this cause; and we doubt not that the following circular, addressed to them by direction of our Committee, will elicit from those now in the field expressions of similar interest, and furnish a collection of Testimonials to the Cause of Peace that will do honor to them, and much good to our cause.

Office of the American Peace Society, }
Boston, September 20, 1852. }

Rev. and dear Sir,—

You are doubtless aware, that the American Peace Society, sustained more or less by Christians of every Protestant denomination in our land, has long been laboring, in conjunction with friends of Peace in other parts of Christendom, to do away the custom of war, and secure the perpetual reign of Peace coextensive with Christianity, by the simple, Scriptural process of applying the Gospel aright to the case.

In behalf of this object, we wish to enlist not only Christians at home, but equally those Pioneers of the Cross who have gone forth to preach peace and good-will, Jesus and Him crucified, throughout the pagan world. It is not merely because they must necessarily cast the mould of faith and character for all the future Christians of Asia, Africa, and the islands of the Pacific, but also because we need in behalf of this cause your reflex influence upon the Christian community here who sustain you by their contributions and prayers. Of the early missionaries from our country, such as HALL, JUDSON and their associates, we already have some precious memorials of their sympathy for this cause in communications from them to our predecessors in the Peace Society; and, not doubting that you feel very much as they did, we beg leave to present a few points for your consideration, and to ask in reply such an expression of your views as you may be disposed to give, and allow us to use at discretion, for our encouragement and aid in this arduous work.

1. Let us, then, inquire how far you regard this cause as identical in spirit and results with your own, and how far the former as essential or tributary to the latter.

2. To what extent has the practice of war among nations reputably Christian, prejudiced the unevangelized against the gospel, and obstructed its spread, or neutralized its saving power?

3. What influence, in your judgment, would a general war in Christendom, or a protracted war between two such countries as England and America, be likely to have on the missionary cause?

4. What do you think would be, or what have you found actually to be, the effect of war on the immediate field of missionary operations?

5. Since the gospel has been preached in Christendom for fifteen centuries without abolishing war in a single nation, and as we must all desire to prevent so long a delay in accomplishing this part of its promised results among the heathen, what can be done, or what should be attempted, by Christians at home and by missionaries, to make sure henceforth of having peace go hand in hand with the gospel over the whole earth?

6. Is there, on this part of Christianity, any special defect, and if so, what, in the education of Christian missionaries for their work?

If you see fit, dear Sir, to answer these inquiries in detail, or to make any other suggestions on the general subject that may serve to guide or encourage us in the great Christian enterprise entrusted for the present to our care, you will oblige us; and, if you desire for yourself, or for use in promoting our cause, any of our publications, of which we have several volumes,

and a large number of tracts, as well as a monthly periodical, we shall be glad to forward one copy or more of each and all for your mission, in any way you may direct. We hardly need say, that we are especially desirous of putting ourselves in more extensive and more frequent correspondence with our friends on missionary ground, and shall always esteem it a favor to hear from them on this subject at their pleasure. Allow us to hope for an answer to this at your earliest convenience, and thus oblige, on behalf of the American Peace Society, and by order of its Executive Committee,

Yours in the Gospel of Peace,

GEO. C. BECKWITH,
Corresponding Secretary.

DEPOSITORIES OF THE SOCIETY'S PUBLICATIONS.—Our readers are already apprised of the effort now in progress to procure the means of re-issuing our stereotyped tracts and volumes in quantities sufficient to establish depositories of them in different parts of the country. By the liberality of our friends, we have begun the proposed re-issue; and our Committee, at a recent meeting,

"Voted, That the Corresponding Secretary be authorised to establish in central places, especially at the West, Depositories of the Society's Publications.

AGENTS.—The Committee, also, re-appointed a Lecturing Agent at the West, and would be glad to send forth a much larger number than we have ever employed, as soon as men of the requisite qualifications can be found. The service, however, is so very hard, and is relieved by so few personal advantages, that we have found it exceedingly difficult to obtain the men we want; but we trust that the God of Peace will ere long raise up such leaders in "the sacramental hosts" of this cause as it so much needs, and must eventually secure.

As a partial substitute for the labors of Lecturing Agents entirely devoted to the work, the Committee have anew authorised the appointment of Local Agents, active friends of Peace, willing without charge to act, on behalf of the Society, "in their respective localities, by preaching on the subject at their convenience, bringing it before ecclesiastical and other public bodies, and receiving contributions to the cause." Some of our friends have already performed in this capacity services that deserve our warmest thanks; and we presume that these will cheerfully continue their labor of love for our common cause, and that many others will ere long be found ready to "go and do likewise."

AGENCY LABORS.

We have hitherto employed less of this service than we ought, little more indeed than enough to set and keep our publications at work on the public mind. As a specimen, however, of what our servants are doing, we give a few short extracts from our Secretary's report of one or two recent excursions:—

A LECTURING EXCURSION.—In the month of July, having made arrangements for a long lecturing tour into Maine, I started on Saturday to spend the Sabbath in Dover, N. H., where I was cordially received, and preached on Peace during the day to the Orthodox and Unitarian congregations. On

Monday morning, after collecting some \$20 from a few individuals there,—and we have some excellent, steadfast friends in Dover,—I took cars, on a similar errand, for Exeter; but, as our chief friends here were absent, I called in the afternoon at Durham, where I collected a few dollars for the cause. On Tuesday I finished my efforts at collection of funds (about \$40) in Dover, and went in the evening to deliver a lecture at Salmon Falls, N. H. The gentlemanly agent of the manufacturing company there, P. LAWTON, Esq., had made the best arrangements practicable to give me a hearing; and I addressed in a beautiful hall a number larger than I could well have expected in weather so oppressively hot. From the agent and a few other friends, I obtained nearly ten dollars for the Society, and then proceeded the next evening to lecture in like manner at South Berwick, Me., and subsequently to solicit aid, with some degree of success, both in this place, and at Great Falls, N. H.

It was, I think, in Berwick, that the venerable Founder of our Society began his course of public lecturing on Peace. He had a sister and other friends here, during his visits to whom he used to try his powers in speaking on his favorite theme; and, probably as the fruit of his labors, I have always found a few devoted friends of our cause here. I had before heard of an excellent maiden lady here, now some eighty years old, as a warm-hearted friend of peace, but had never seen her. I walked out under a broiling sun to her residence in the vicinity of the village, and was amply repaid by her fresh reminiscences of Mr. Ladd, and the undiminished fervor of her zeal for our cause. We may well take courage and hope for its success when God thus enshrines it in such hearts.

I failed in my arrangements for a lecture next evening at Saco; and, after collecting a small amount there, I passed on to spend the Sabbath in Saccarappa and Portland. In the former, Rev. Mr. ASHLEY, the Congregational Pastor, received me with great kindness, and in his church I preached twice, and took up a collection. In the evening, the Rev. Mr. LORD, nephew of William Ladd, and now preaching at Westbrook, took me into Portland, to the Rev. J. W. CHICKERING's church, where, though the weather was so uncomfortable, I had a very good audience, and a fine opportunity of pressing the claims of our cause especially as an auxiliary in the work of the world's conversion. On Monday I called on some of our friends, and obtained nearly \$40 from the few whom I saw. The time was most unfavorable for such an application, or I should doubtless have raised much more; but I was more than ever encouraged by the tone of feeling with which I was generally received here.

I cannot help mentioning one case. I had a long conversation with the Hon. SAMUEL FESSENDEN, for many years one of the first lawyers in the State, and found him much better informed on the subject of Peace, and much more thorough in his views of its fundamental principles, than I had expected. He gave what I may call a brief sketch of his experience. "I used," said he, "to take much interest in military matters. So long ago as our last war with England, in 1812, I came down here from the country in command of a company for the defence of Portland; and I continued my interest in military affairs until I reached, not many years after, one of the highest offices, and became, as you know, a General. I did not then stop to think whether it was consistent or not with my profession as a Christian; but I had for a neighbor a worthy Quaker who seemed bent on bringing and keeping this question before my mind. I was fond enough of making a display, especially on muster days; but Friend Hussey was sure, some how or other, to come across my path on all such occasions. I recollect one in particular. Mounted on my charger, and decked out in the usual insignia of a Brigadier General, I was riding along the street at the head of my staff,

when I came all at once upon Friend Hussey, who seemed not at all disposed to make any haste in getting out of the way, but turning up his mild, bland face, archly said, "Ah! Friend Samuel, thee got thy *Christian armor* on to-day, has thee?" The Quaker said no more; but the question,—*thee got thy Christian armor on?*—kept ringing in my ear all day; nor did I ever get it out of my mind until I gave up my commission as a military officer, and came to the conclusion, after long and careful inquiry, that the gospel, rightly understood, condemns *all* war. In this view, indeed, I preceded my friend, Mr. Ladd, and urged him to take it years before he did." I will only add, as one proof of our friend's interest in our cause, that he gave ten dollars, and said he hoped he should have a like sum ready for us *every year*.

We have no room for any more of even such brief details from our Secretary's report; but, as a little fuller specimen, we will just add, that the next evening he went for a lecture to Yarmouth, the next to Brunswick, the residence of our able and excellent friend, Prof. Upham, and the one following to Beth, whence he went for the Sabbath to Augusta and Hallowell, extending his excursion through Winthrop as far as Waterville, the seat of the college under the auspices of our Baptist brethren. He often lectured every successive evening, and usually delivered about six discourses a week; but the delivery of these was scarcely a quarter of the labor he performed, since he spent almost every day, from morning till late at night, in soliciting aid to our cause. All this, too, while "the dog-star raged" in July and August; but, even under such unfavorable circumstances, he succeeded in this part of his business much better than his fears, having collected an average of some \$12 a day during his excursion. He was everywhere received kindly, and *all* the ministers, so far as he reports, cheerfully interested themselves in preparing the way for him. They opened their churches, notified his lectures in other congregations, invited him to their own houses, and in various other ways aided him in his good but arduous and irksome work. His success here, as everywhere, depended very much on their ready and cordial co-operation.

A SHORT EXCURSION FOR FUNDS.—We will give only one specimen of three days. "Early in August, I preached in Bradford for our excellent friend, Rev NATHAN MUNROE; but, worn by incessant labors for several weeks previous, I did not stop there to call on our friends, and the pressure of other duties in Boston kept me from returning to the thankless task of solicitation until September 14, when I went to Bradford by the first train of cars, and, after spending the day there and in Haverhill, raising \$25 in the latter, and nearly \$30 in the former, I took the latest train to Georgetown. Here I spent the next day, in the midst of incessant rain, but succeeded in collecting \$25 before the last train back to Bradford. The next morning I took cars to Exeter, where in two hours I obtained from a few good friends of the cause \$12, and then came by the return train back to Lawrence and Methuen, where, before the last train to Boston, I collected \$15 more. Thus, in an absence of two nights and three days, I raised upwards of \$100, with pledges of more in nearly every place I visited."

We give the foregoing brief specimens of the way in which our servants labor for the cause, of the kindness with which they are received, and the success attendant on the right sort of effort. Such efforts *ought* to be extended *ere long* over our whole country.

Receipts since the last to Sept.

Deep River, Ct.,—Ezekiel Rich,	\$1 00	Portland, Me., Saml. Fes-	
Boston—S. K. Whipple,	2 00	senden,	10 00
Edward Blake,	2 00	Eben Steele,	5 00
Josiah F. Bumstead,	2 00	Nathanl. Blanchard,	5 00
Samuel Gilbert,	2 00	John Neal	5 00
Joseph H. Adams,	2 00	E. Greely,	2 00
Benj. W. Nichols,	2 00	William Chase,	2 00
A. L. Haskell,	2 00	William Willis,	2 00
Biver S. Ayres,	2 00	Others,	7 50
Lmes Loring,	2 00	Yarmouth, Me,	7 00
Benj. Thaxter,	2 00	Brunswick, Me., Prof. Up-	
Lewis Newcomb,	5 00	ham,	5 00
Charles Scudder,	2 00	C. G. Gilman,	3 00
J. N. Daniels,	2 00	Prof. Packard,	2 00
John A. Andrews,	2 00	Others,	4 00
Ellis G. Loring,	2 00	Bath, Me., John Patten,	5 00
Benjamin Guild,	3 00	Geo. F. Patten,	5 00
W. C. Stimpson,	2 00	Wm. M. Rogers,	2 00
E. H. Wakefield,	2 00	Dr. Ellingwood,	2 00
John Field,	15 00	Others,	7 00
J. W. Converse,	5 00	Augusta, Me,	21 00
Others in smaller sums	4 00	Hallowell, Me., Rufus K.	1 00
Fryburg, Me., Joseph Colby	64 00	Pearce,	10 00
Saccarappa, Me., Collection in	10 00	R. G. Lincoln,	5 00
Congregational Church	6 00	Williams Emmons,	3 00
Saco, Me., from three friends,	3 00	Artemas Leonard	3 00
South Berwick, Me., John		Jona. Cole,	2 00
Plummer	2 00	Sophia E. Bond,	3 00
Others in smaller sums	1 30	A. H. Howard,	2 00
Salmon Falls, N. H., P.	5 00	Others,	6 00
Lawton,	4 00	Winthrop, in part to con. Rev.	34 00
Others,	4 50	Rufus M. Sawyer, a L. M.	
Great Falls, N. H.,	8 50	by his Cong.,	12 50
Dover, N. H., A. A. Tufts,	8 00	Lewiston Falls, Me., Sam'l	
William Woodman,	5 00	Pickard,	10 00
Benj. Barnes,	3 00	Others, in smaller sums,	15 25
Dea. P. Cushing & Bro.,	5 00	Keene, N.H., D. Adams,	2 00
Daniel Osborne,	3 00	Asa Duren,	2 00
W. H. Alden,	2 00	W. P. Wheeler,	2 00
Andrew Pierce,	2 00	Others, in smaller sums,	10 50
A. Folsom,	2 00	Northampton, John Bright	18 50
Others,	7 00	Reuben Ellis,	1 00
Durham, N.H., G. & W. P.	39 00		11 50
Frost,	2 00		
Others,	2 00		
	4 00		
		Total,	\$331 25

TERMS—Advocate of Peace, monthly, 16 pp., one vol. in two years; \$100 in advance.

Book of Peace, 12 mo., 606 pp., \$1 00
 facts, unbound, at 12 pp. for a cent.
 phain on Peace, 25

Hancock on Peace, 19c.
 Dymond on War, 25
 Peace Manual, paper covers, 19—cloth, 25.

Jay's Review of Mexican War, cloth, 50c; paper covers, 30c. Livermore do. A very liberal discount for re-sale, or gratuitous distribution.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY'S OFFICE, 21 Cornhill, Boston. GEORGE C. BECKWITH, Corresponding Secretary; WM C. BROWN, Office Agent.

POSTAGE.—In advance through Massachusetts, $\frac{1}{2}$ cents a quarter, or 3 cents a year; elsewhere in the United States, double this.

THE
DUTY AND ADVANTAGE
OF
STUDYING THE PROPHETIC SCRIPTURES.

THE persuasion that the language and symbols of the prophetic Scriptures are so peculiar and mysterious as to render it impossible to determine their meaning, is so general and absolute, that with few exceptions, those in the sacred office do not regard themselves as under obligation to study and endeavor to understand them, but deem it injudicious even, and likely to lead them to mistake their own fancies for the mind of the Spirit, and betray them into fanaticism. The interest in them accordingly, which as divine revelations they are suited to excite, has almost expired in the church. They are not made the subject of instruction from the pulpit, nor of private investigation, much more than they would be if they were not regarded as the oracles of God. This conviction, however, is undoubtedly unauthorized, and were the imputation which it involves, realized, would be abandoned by those who indulge it. For how injurious to God is the assumption on which it proceeds, that he has made a series of communications to us constituting a large portion of his word, which are of such a nature, that it is the part of good sense and discretion to neglect and shun them; as though we understood what becomes us better than he, and had risen to such a knowledge of ourselves and him, and such a refinement of taste, as to discern that he has misjudged our faculties and the means that are adapted to subserve our improvement! Such an assumption is as unjustifiable in respect to the prophecies, as it were in regard to any other portion of the Scriptures. For they are addressed to us by God as our moral governor, as much as his laws are. They are a part of the series of

communications from which we are to form our views of his perfections, rights, designs, and will, as much as his commands, his threatenings, and his promises. They are a part of the great system of means which he employs to engage our faith, to support us under trials, and to guide us in duty ; and have accordingly as high a title to our study as the law or the gospel, and can no more justifiably be debarred from the influence they are adapted to exert.

The neglect of the prophecies, under the persuasion that they are unintelligible, and the study of them unwise and dangerous, is inconsistent also with the awe, the faith, and the interest in the great designs of God, which his people ordinarily feel, as well as with his rights. Reverence for his word, confidence in his wisdom, a profound interest in the measures of his government, and a fervent desire to know what his purposes are in respect to the redemption of the world, are natural to his children ; not unbelief and indifference. Notwithstanding they make no effort to interpret the prophecies, they after all, probably with scarce an exception, have a lurking feeling that they must be intelligible, and that when understood, they will be found to be as worthy as the other Scriptures of the wisdom that inspired them. And were they placed in conditions in which they felt nothing of the prejudice which they have inherited from their predecessors, and acted out their genuine sentiments, they would display an interest in them and make exertions to ascertain their meaning, that would be in harmony with their principles and professions as his people. Let us suppose for example, that the attempts of Diocletian and Galerius in the beginning of the fourth century to destroy all the copies of the Scriptures, had seemed to be successful in respect to the Apocalypse, but that after having been lost to the church for fifteen centuries, it had lately been found, and with such evidences of its genuineness as to cause it to be universally acknowledged as the revelation that was made to John ; with what profound reverence would it be received by the church ! What lofty interest would it excite ! With what eager curiosity would it be read and studied ! What a stir would it occasion in the theological and literary world ! Instead of listlessness and neglect, it would be procured and read, not only by every minister of

the gospel, by the learned and cultivated of all professions and classes, and by every member of the church, but by all of every rank who have any acquaintance with letters; and a knowledge of its signs, the principle on which they are employed, and their meaning, be deemed essential to one's respectability. It would be ignorance and indifference that would then be discreditable; not curiosity and knowledge. The interest, however, the zeal, the faith, the industry, the resolution and perseverance, that would then be displayed, would only be such as are natural to the people of God, and as his word is accustomed to excite. The alienation from the prophecies, accordingly, and indifference to their import, which are now so common, are not the offspring of their genuine and characteristic affections towards him, but are dissonant and unnatural, and ought to be discarded.

The response to this, which will naturally rise in most minds, will probably be: You have indeed judged aright of our feelings in respect to the prophetic Scriptures. We are far from being indifferent in regard to them. It would afford us a high satisfaction to know what it is that they reveal. We are in doubt and perplexity in respect to the designs of God, and the issue of the great movements that are occupying the political and religious world; and need a clearer light to guide us. But how are we to ascertain what the meaning of the prophecies is? A long line of great and good men who have enjoyed all the advantages of leisure, and all the aids of learning, have devoted their lives to their interpretation; but instead of having determined with any degree of certainty their import, their labors have only served to show that they are not understood, and to beget the impression that any attempts by us to unfold them must necessarily be wholly unavailing. Show us that the obstacles to their explication are not absolutely insurmountable: prove that the ill-success of others has not arisen from any intrinsic difficulty of the subject: and we shall be ready to make exertions to learn what it is that they teach, proportional to their claims to our regard as the oracles of God, and to the interest of the great themes of which they treat.

What, however, is deemed requisite to constitute such proof? To demonstrate that the ill-success of commentators hereto-

fore, has not arisen from an inexplicable intricacy of the prophecies, can anything more be necessary than to show, that they have universally proceeded on false hypotheses, and instead of interpreting them, have only employed themselves in guessing at meanings, or inventing unauthorized constructions? In proof of the possibility of an easy and satisfactory interpretation, can anything more be demanded or desired, than that it should be shown that the symbolic prophecies themselves, which present the chief difficulty, contain a revelation of the principle on which their signs are used, and on such a scale as to render all doubt in respect to the laws by which they are to be interpreted, unreasonable and impossible? Or can anything more be required in respect to the unsymbolic prophecies than such an analysis of their figures, which are the principal source of perplexity, and determination of their laws, as to render their explication as easy and demonstrative as any other part of the Sacred Word? Nothing more can be asked or required, all will probably respond; and if such aids can be furnished, we shall feel it to be an imperative duty to avail ourselves of them, and make every effort in our power to learn what the great things are that are contained in the prophetic Scriptures.

It is to furnish those aids, and excite the church to the study, that the THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL is established. We propose to show that those universally, who have heretofore written on the prophecies, have proceeded on false views of the nature of symbols and figures, and necessarily erred in proportion as they adhered to their principles. We undertake to demonstrate that the symbolic prophecies contain a revelation of the principles on which their signs are employed, which furnishes the most ample means for their satisfactory interpretation, and sets aside a large part of the constructions that have commonly been put on them. We propose to present an analysis of the several figures that are employed by the prophets, and statement and proof of their laws, that will render their explanation equally easy and certain, and rescue them from the misrepresentations to which they are commonly subjected. We design also, in a series of articles, to apply the laws of symbols and figures thus ascertained, to the prophecies of the Old and New Testament, and point out the results to

which they lead ; and thus put it in the power of all who will give the subject such a measure of attention as is requisite to master any large question, to make themselves familiar with it, and possess themselves of the disclosures which God has made through the prophets of his great designs. This we have in a degree accomplished in the numbers that are already published, as may be seen from the following statement of their contents.

No. I. The Introductory article of the first number, published in July, is employed in stating the claims of the prophetic Scriptures to investigation ; and contrasting the imperfect knowledge, neglect, and indifference of those in the sacred office in regard to them, with the curiosity, enterprise, laboriousness, and success of the students of other branches of learning. The second article treats of the false methods of interpreting the Apocalypse which have heretofore been pursued, and shows that a long series of writers who are regarded as of authority, have founded their explications on assumptions that have no ground in the prophecy itself, and necessarily lead to a misrepresentation of its meaning. Among those assumptions, one of the principal is that of Vitringa, who held that the expositor should, anterior to interpretation, form an hypothesis in respect to the great theme of the Apocalypse, and make it his guide in the solution of the symbols ; which is not to deduce the things foreshown from the media through which they are revealed, but to ascribe to them a signification drawn from some other source. The theory of Mr. Mede, and Mr. Whiston, that the order of the Visions should be taken as "the grand rule of interpretation," has been made the basis of many explications also, and is equally mistaken ; as it makes the meaning of the symbols to depend not on their nature, but on an assumption in respect to the order in which that which they foreshow is to take place. Those who have followed that method, have accordingly employed themselves in a large degree, not in interpreting the symbols, but in ascribing to them, without any regard to their nature and laws, such a meaning as was required by their views of the period in which they were to be accomplished. Mr. Daubuz advanced a different set of theories. He founded many of his interpretations on the hypothesis that symbols are employed on the same principles as the hieroglyphs of the

Egyptians; which is not only to misrepresent symbols, but hieroglyphs also, as they, instead of being representatives of persons and things, are, like letters and words, mere signs of the voice. In another class of his explications he proceeded on the assumption that the visions of the prophets are to be interpreted by the same rules as were employed by the ancient soothsayers in the exposition of dreams; which were wholly fanciful and arbitrary, and lead necessarily to a misrepresentation of the prophecy. The theories of Grotius, Sir Isaac Newton, Eichhorn, Dean Woodhouse, Mr. Frere, Mr. Cuninghame, and several others, are in like manner shown to be erroneous, and the fact thus established, which it is the object of the article to demonstrate, that the ill-success of those writers was not owing to any inherent difficulty in the Apocalypse itself, but to the false methods which they pursued; and that if its meaning is to be ascertained, it must be by a wholly different method of interpretation. The third article, on Professor Stuart's commentary on the Apocalypse, is employed in refuting the hypotheses which he advances respecting the nature of the prophecy, the principles on which it is to be explained, and its meaning. The first of those hypotheses is, that it is an epic poem. The second, that the symbols were invented by the apostle, in place of being exhibited to him in vision. The third, that they are mere drapery, instead of being representative of agents. The fourth, that all the parts of the prophecy have a threefold, or some other artificial division. The fifth, that its special design was to encourage and console Christians of the age in which it was written. The sixth, that its symbols are to be interpreted by the mere laws of philology. The seventh, that an acquaintance with the apocryphal works of the second and third centuries is necessary, in order to a knowledge of its meaning. These assumptions are shown to have been drawn from late rationalistic German writers, and to be erroneous, and the expositions which he founds on them confuted. The fourth article, on Dr. Chalmers's Scripture Readings, presents a view of his genius and character. The fifth is a review of Dr. Dickinson's Religion Teaching by Example. In the sixth, Literary and Critical Notices are given of several recent publications.

No. II. In the first article of the second number, issued in

October, on the Laws of Symbolic Representation, the great fact is stated and demonstrated, which is the ground of our endeavors at a new and satisfactory interpretation, *that the principles on which the symbols are employed are revealed in the prophecies themselves, in the interpretations that are given of them by Christ, the angels, and the prophets.* 2. Their several laws are stated and shown to be involved in those interpretations. 3. The principle is explained of the exceptions that occur to them, and shown in like manner to be revealed. 4. A catalogue, arranged in alphabetic order, is given of the whole series of the symbols of the Old and New Testament, 415 in number. 5. A catalogue is given of the inspired interpretations, 148 in number, in the order in which they occur. 6. It is shown that these laws are applicable in like manner to the whole of the uninterpreted symbols. First, because there are no explications given that involve a different set of laws. Secondly, because there are no uninterpreted symbols that can be shown to be employed on any other principles. Thirdly, because they are the only laws by which a large share of the uninterpreted symbols can be explained, consistently with the truth of the prophecies. Fourthly, because all exceptions that occur, take place on the same ground as the exception, the principle of which is revealed. Each of these considerations is verified by a large array of proofs.

In another article on Mr. Fleming's Rise and Fall of Papacy, his chief views are shown to be erroneous, and the esteem in which he is held as an expositor unmerited:—1. He was not aware that the laws of interpretation are revealed in the prophecies themselves. 2. He had no settled view of the principles on which symbols are used. 3. Most of his constructions are precisely what they should be, if the laws of symbols were the converse of what they are. 4. His prognostications in respect to France and the Papacy are not only founded on false principles, but do not correspond to the events that are alleged as their fulfilment.

The other articles of the number are devoted to other subjects. The chief is a review of the works of Strauss and Neander on the life of Christ, in which, 1st. Dr. Strauss's theory that the gospels are myths is stated, and the grounds he alleges

in its support shown to be inconsistent with the principles by which all other histories are judged, arbitrary, and false. 2d. The views are exhibited on which Neander proceeds :—First, that the gospels are not inspired. Next, that their authors fell into mistakes in many of their narratives. And thirdly, that many of the events which they represent as miraculous, were not of that nature. The principles, accordingly, it is shown, on which he proceeds, are essentially the same as those of Strauss and other naturalists ; that the constructions he places on several of the evangelical narratives are unauthorized and absurd ; that his attempts to set aside the miraculousness of the events which they relate, in place of relieving them from difficulty, involve them in inextricable embarrassment ; and that the assumptions on which he proceeds in those instances lead necessarily, if admitted, to the rejection of all the other miracles recorded in the sacred volume ; and are, when divested of the fair terms in which they are disguised, nothing less than the principles of infidelity. The third article, on Morrell's History of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the Nineteenth Century, presents, first, a statement of Kant's view of the understanding and reason, and proofs that it is a mere theory, unsupported by any evidence ; that it is inconsistent with our consciousness, and demonstratively false ; and that it denies the possibility of our having any knowledge of the being of God, or any other existence besides ourselves, and was devised for the purpose of overturning the foundation of revealed and natural religion, and giving atheism the pretence of a logical demonstration. Next, the pantheistic systems of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, are stated, and the ground pointed out on which they and other modern rationalists reject the inspiration of the Scriptures. And thirdly, Coleridge's theory of the understanding and reason is shown to have been adopted from Kant without alteration, and to be obnoxious to the same philosophical and theological objections. In the closing article critical notices are given of several works lately published.

The number issued in January contains an analysis of the different species of figures employed by the prophets, and statement of their laws, in which it is shown :—First, that each kind has its own peculiar nature, and is to be interpreted by

its own laws. Next, that their explication is as easy and certain as the determination of problems in any other branch of knowledge. Thirdly, that one of the most significant and beautiful figures of the prophets has been universally misunderstood, and confounded with others of a different nature. Fourthly, exemplifications are given of the relation of their laws to the old methods of interpretation, and the mode in which they set aside a great number of constructions that have been falsely put on passages of the Old Testament. And finally, it is indicated, and will in subsequent articles be shown, that they settle the meaning beyond doubt of a number of the most important predictions that have heretofore been in debate ; such as whether the Israelites are to return to their own land, and be reorganized as a nation ; whether the holy dead are to be raised anterior to the millennium ; and whether the nations are to survive Christ's advent, be converted, and live under his reign.

The second article contains an analysis of the principles on which Mr. Faber conducts his interpretations, in which it is shown that his views of the nature both of figures and symbols are essentially erroneous ; that a large part of his constructions are at the utmost distance from truth, and that he has contributed much by his mistaken methods to generate the aversion and disgust with which the subject has of late years been regarded.

In a subsequent article on the relation of the present dispensation to the future reign of Christ, the common theories respecting the reason that the redemption of the race is at present restricted within such narrow limits are confuted ; the assumption shown to be unauthorized on which the Protestant churches are proceeding, that the nations are to be Christianized and sanctified by the means that are now employed for that purpose without any extraordinary divine interposition ; and proofs given that the design of the present dispensation is, to prepare the way for the personal interposition and reign of Christ, when all nations and families are for a long series of ages to be sanctified.

In a notice in another article of the Rev. E. Bickersteth's Warning to the Churches in respect to the judgments that are at hand, the assumption on which he founds a portion of his

interpretations is shown to be unauthorized and erroneous. The views are noticed also which he presents of the moral and religious condition of Great Britain. The other articles of the January number are a review of Dr. Spring's work on the Power of the Pulpit, which treats of the chief causes that impair the influence of the ministry; a notice of the Memoir of Mrs. Van Lennep; an account of ancient cities lately discovered in Lycia; a description of a portion of Australia that has recently been explored; and critical notices of several late publications.

The April number is to contain a continuation of the analysis of Mr. Faber's system of interpretation; an application of the laws of figures and symbols to some commentary on one of the Old Testament prophets, and exemplification of the results to which they lead in the refutation of mistaken hypotheses and constructions, and determination of the true meaning; and an enumeration and classification of the figures of a part of Isaiah.

Each of the subsequent numbers will contain a discussion of one or more questions that respect the prophecies. The themes that require to be treated are numerous and of great interest. Among them are, 1st, the theories of writers on the Apocalypse who have not yet been noticed. It is designed to continue an analysis of them, till a full conviction is wrought that the views on which they proceed are mistaken. 2. A similar trial by the laws of figures and symbols of the popular explications of the prophecies of the Old Testament. This is a large and most important field. A just interpretation of the ancient prophets will set aside many crude and mistaken views that prevail in respect to the present dispensation, and that which is hereafter to be exercised. 3. A fuller exemplification of the laws of figures and symbols. 4. An enumeration and classification of the figures of the ancient prophets. This wide and attractive ground, which is most favorable to the cultivation of the understanding and refinement of the taste, and of the utmost importance to the interpreter, is almost wholly unexplored. 6. A fuller exemplification of the analogies on which symbols are founded. This subject, which is one of the most interesting and most important to the expositor, is almost totally neglected. The question has

scarcely been asked, and never satisfactorily answered, by those who have treated of the symbolic prophecies, why it is that a star is employed by Christ as a representative of a teacher of the gospel, and a candlestick of a church; why lamps in the temple are used as symbols of the Holy Spirit; waters, of nations and multitudes; or a rain and hail storm of a slaughtering and devastating army. An understanding of the principle, however, on which they are employed, and a facility in applying it, are indispensable in order to determine from the symbols what the agents are which they are used to represent. 7. A definition and exemplification of the office of figures and types, in distinction from symbols. 8. Explications of the prophecies of the Old and New Testament. 9. Especially of those which respect the powers denoted by the wild beast. 10. Of those which show who the witnesses are; what their office is; what their slaughter and resurrection denote, and whether they are yet future. 11. Of those which show who they are who are symbolized by great Babylon. 12. A determination of the question, Who the agents are who are the subjects of the fifth vial? 13. Who are to be the subjects of the sixth vial? 14. What the fall of great Babylon denotes? 15. What predictions of Daniel and John have met their fulfilment? 16. What the great events are that are to precede the millennium? 17. Whether the nations are to be converted by the mere instruments which are now employed by the church, or by extraordinary and miraculous means? 18. Whether the Israelites are to be restored to their ancient land, re-established as a separate nation, and subsist there for ever? 19. Whether Christ's second advent is to take place anterior to the millennium? 20. Whether the sanctified who shall have died are to be raised before the millennium? 21. Whether Christ is to reign on earth during that period, and what the offices are which the risen and glorified saints are to fill in his kingdom? 22. The nature of the millennial dispensation. 23. The nature of the sway that is to be exercised over the earth after that period. 24. Whether mankind are for ever to subsist here and multiply, as they would had they not fallen? 25. The views with which missions and other endeavors to Christianize the nations should be conducted. 26. The duty of those in the sacred office to study the prophetic Scriptures, and make them the subject of instruction to their people.

27. Their adaptation to exalt the views of God, enlarge the knowledge of his government, and nourish the faith, awe, love, and zeal of his people. 28. Their relation to the duties of the church at the present period. 29. The grandeur of God's designs. 30. The sublime prospects of his people.

It will perhaps be imagined that even on the supposition that the principles of interpretation are revealed in the prophecies themselves, and are what we allege, that still they are extremely intricate; that a long course of cultivation is requisite to a full understanding and application of them; and that they must be left therefore to persons who are either expressly devoted to their investigation, or at least have leisure and large libraries.

But the obligation to study them, we answer, does not depend on the question whether they can be comprehended at a glance. We are not freed from the duty, because it requires time, vigorous efforts, and much cultivation. Do Christ's ministers make it a condition of their undertaking any other work which he requires of them, that it shall not interrupt their ease, or withdraw them from secular occupations; that it shall not put them under a necessity of unfolding, refining, and exalting the powers with which he has endowed them; that it shall not compel them to learn anything more of him, his government, themselves, or their fellow men, than they already know? There is no proviso of that nature inserted in his commandments. So far from consulting his people's ease, or relieving them from difficult duties, he requires them to love him with all the heart, and mind, and strength; assigns them labors in which they are to display that love, that involve the highest exertion of all their energies; and conducts his providence in such a manner as to constrain them to show whether they will fulfil such duties. It is not in conditions of ease and exemption from temptation, but in periods of great difficulty, in circumstances that demand the highest degrees of faith, love, and devotedness, that the great question is decided whether they are truly his children, and proofs given by them of their allegiance, that are made the ground of his treating them as his friends. It was when Abraham was required to sacrifice his son, that the question respecting his fidelity was settled. It was when Job was deprived of his property, bereft of his children, tortured with

disease, and overwhelmed with reproaches and dishonor, that the genuineness of his love and submission was demonstrated, and God was shown to be justified in pronouncing him upright. And he calls his children generally to very similar trials; and one to which he now subjects them is this, in respect to the revelation he has made of the issue of the present dispensation and the reign that is to follow. They are put to the question, whether they have such a regard for his authority; such an interest in his purposes respecting our world; such a desire to fulfil the duties which he requires of them, that they will make the exertions that are necessary to learn what it is that he has foreshown in his word; and their conduct in respect to it is as expressive of their hearts, as their course under any other trial. The acquisition of that knowledge is attended by no difficulty but such as his wisdom appoints. It involves no greater surrender of ease, or severer exertion of the intellect, than are requisite to exhibit the love which he demands. And those who neglect it can no more expect his approval, than though they, for a similar reason, refused any other duty which he enjoins.

The subject, in fact, however, is not of any peculiar difficulty. It is not to be compared in intricacy with the higher branches of mathematics, metaphysics, or theology. It is far more within the grasp of educated persons generally than many questions which they are accustomed to master. Were the whole body of those in the ministry, for example, to study this and some other subject that requires attention and discipline, such as the laws of perception, volition, or conscience, nine hundred and fifty would rise to an easy comprehension of this, and find it a source of exhilaration and delight, where fifty would gain a tolerable knowledge of Locke on the Understanding, Edwards on the Will, or Butler on Human Nature. It does not require, by any means, as large a share of attention, as multitudes appropriate to the study of the ancient languages. There are thousands of the young, who might obtain a good acquaintance with it in a small part of the time which they devote to the cultivation of music. Surely the disciples of Jesus, who expect from his hands soon a crown of eternal life, will not think a knowledge of the great disclosures he has made respecting the kingdom in which they are for ever to serve him, unworthy of such an effort. Those in the sacred

office, to whom he has expressly assigned the task of interpreting his word, and proclaiming his coming reign, will not deem such a measure of study too great to learn what that reign is to be ; what world is to be its scene ; and who are to share in its dignities and bliss. Instead, their love, their interest in his great designs, their desire of a fuller knowledge of that immortal existence to which he is to exalt them, and their wish to fulfil to his acceptance the work with which he has intrusted them, and lead their flocks to his kingdom, will prompt them to make the experiment ; and when they have once entered on the subject, become acquainted with its elements, and caught a glimpse of its vastness and significance, they will no longer need an impulse from others to excite them to its study, but will be led on by its novelty, its beauty, and its grandeur, and regard it as one of the most important in the whole circle of theology, shedding light on every other, exalting their apprehensions of the divine government, furnishing them with authentic and delightful views of the life on which they are soon to enter, supplying them with new means of interesting and instructing their people, and inspiring them with higher thoughts of the ends of their office, and greater zeal and resolution to discharge its duties. Nor will they be content that the knowledge of it should be confined to themselves, but will desire that it should be shared by their people, and especially the young.

Within a brief period indeed, we doubt not, that instead of being regarded with prejudice and distaste, it will attract the attention, and engage the interest of the religious and cultivated generally. An acquaintance with it will be found to be of easy acquisition. The knowledge it involves of the principles of analogy and the laws of figures, will cause it to be introduced into the higher schools and seminaries ; while to parents who wish to give their children a refined and religious education, it will become a favorite subject of instruction, from its eminent adaptation to excite curiosity, unfold the understanding, give truth and elegance to the taste, exalt the fancy, and above all, enlarge the thoughts of God, and invest the coming life with interest and beauty. A family of sons and daughters who should gain a knowledge of the different species of figures and symbols, and the criteria by which they are distinguished from one another, familiarize themselves

with the application of their laws, and learn how to test interpretations by them, and confute such as are false, would obtain in the process a higher and more beneficial evolution of their faculties than from any other study. It involves as useful a discipline of the intellect as geometry or algebra ; as direct a culture of the taste and fancy, as rhetoric or poetry ; unfolds a boundless field for historical investigation, and presents a motive for the study of safe, interesting, and useful books, in place of such as are pernicious ; and, which is of far higher consideration, exhibits the designs of God in a clearness and greatness that are not seen anywhere else ; unveils the work of Christ in a grandeur of which without it we should have had no conception ; and discloses events of which the world is soon to become the scene, that are adapted in the utmost degree to impress the imagination, to fill the heart with awe, to beget a sense of God's dominion, and to inspire a desire for that immortal life of youth, beauty, innocence, and bliss, to which the race is soon to be exalted. Such parts of the subject will be treated in a few numbers, and such exemplifications given, as will enable persons of ordinary talents, and especially such as have a quick perception of analogies, without any greater attention than is required to gain a knowledge of any important branch of education, to familiarize themselves with its principles and interpret by them with the ease and exactness with which they apply the rules of arithmetic, the axioms and definitions of geometry, or the laws of grammar.

THE THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL is issued quarterly, in July, October, January, and April.

It is edited by DAVID N. LORD.

It is published by FRANKLIN KNIGHT, to whom orders and remittances may be addressed at 140 Nassau street.

The price is *Three Dollars* a year, payable in advance.

The numbers of a year will make a volume of about 700 pages.

The first No. was issued in July, 1848. The No. for April, 1849, will complete the first volume.

NEW YORK, *January*, 1849.

Persons who have received the first number, and do not design to become subscribers, are desired to return it to the Publisher, and indicate on the envelope by whom it is sent.